

125095

JPRS-TAC-86-014

4 February 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

19980604 105

DMC QUALITY INSPECTED

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

8
80
A05

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

4 February 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: Shultz Tour of W. Europe Connected With SDI Participation (Moscow TASS, 10 Dec 85; Moscow World Service, 11 Dec 85).....	1
'Additional Pressure'	1
SDI Is 'Magic Wand', by Yuriy Reshetnikov	2
Soviet Reports, Comment on FRG Talks in U.S. on SDI (Moscow TASS, various dates).....	3
FRG's Bangemann Departs, by Sergey Sosnovskiy	3
PRAVDA Cited on Talks	4
Talks Begin, by Vladislav Legantsov	4
FRG's Strauss, Ruehl Cited	5
FRG Public Concerned, by Gennadiy Kulbitskiy	6
FRG Trade Union Declaration	6
Moscow: U.S. 'Subverting' ABM Treaty With Amendments (Boris Andrianov; Moscow Domestic Service, 9 Dec 85).....	7
Soviet General Details U.S. ABM Treaty Violations (V. Obinyakov; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 1 Jan 86).....	9
TASS: Congressman Criticizes U.S. Interpretation of ABM Treaty (Moscow TASS, 2 Jan 86).....	12
Soviet Commentary on U.S. Laser Research (Moscow TASS, 13 Jan 86; Moscow to North America, 14 Jan 86).....	13
Shows Offensive Capability	13
Seeks 'Military Edge'	13

PRAVDA: Go-Ahead Given to U.S. Arms Race 'Expansion' (V. Gan; Moscow PRAVDA, 18 Dec 85).....	15
USSR's Ponomarev on CPSU Program, Arms Race (B. N. Ponomarev; Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 29 Dec 85).....	16
PRAVDA: Congress Shows 'Unpredictable Consequences' of SDI (Moscow PRAVDA, 7 Dec 85).....	22
Moscow TV on ASTEC Meeting, Military Monopolies, SDI (Tomas Kolesnichenko; Moscow Television Service, 15 Dec 85).....	23
TASS: UK's Hambleton Heads SDI Research Cooperation (Moscow TASS, 11 Dec 85).....	25
USSR: SDI Research Continues; Americans' Concern Grows (Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 15 Dec 85).....	26
TASS Reports International Reaction to SDI (Moscow TASS, 10 Jan 86).....	28
SDI 'Space Version of Frankenstein' (Vladimir Bogachev; Moscow to North America, 10 Jan 86)....	29
Soviet Academicians Examine Effects of SDI, Arms Race (Nikolay Zaborin; Moscow MOSCOW NEWS, 29 Dec 85).....	31
New Soviet Book on Space Activity Urges Space Law (I. Kotlyarov; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 3 Jan 86).....	36
USSR's Gen Chervov on U.S. Space Arms Building (Nikolay Chervov Interview; Prague RUDE PRAVO, 9 Jan 86)...	37
European Participation in SDI Probed (KAPITAAL & BUSINESS, No 15, 1985).....	40
Briefs	
TASS Cites Former U.S. Official	49
USSR Academician Cited	49
TASS on Weinberger, Abe Talks	49
U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS	
USSR Comments on Preparations for Opening of Geneva Talks (Various sources, various dates).....	50
Karpov Issues Statement	50
U.S. Officials' Remarks, by Vladimir Bogachev	51
U.S. Sincerity 'In Doubt'	51

Possibility for Success Exists, by Vladimir Bogachev	52
Results Depend on Approach, by Aleksandr Druzhinin	54
New Approach Hoped For, by Georgiy Zubkov	55
Adelman Forecasts Are 'Propaganda Ploys'	56
 TASS: U.S. Group Says Verification Technology Exists (Moscow TASS, 18 Dec 85).....	 57
 Moscow Comments on Need for Disarmament (Vladimir Tsvetov; Moscow Domestic Service, 13 Dec 85).....	 58
 Moscow to North America Contrasts U.S., Soviet Arms Policies (Vladislav Kozyakov; Moscow to North America, 27 Dec 85)...	 59
 Moscow Questions U.S. Sincerity in Arms Talks (Nikolay Agayants; Moscow Domestic Service, 30 Dec 85).....	 60
 Moscow: 'Promising,' 'Contradictory' Start to New Year (Nikolay Shishlin; Moscow Television Service, 5 Jan 86)....	 61
 Moscow: U.S., USSR Together Can Realize Hope for Better Future (Vladyslav Kozyakov; Moscow to North America, 3 Jan 86)....	 63
 Moscow Paper on Safeguarding Geneva Summit Gains (Nikolay Pastukhov; Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 7 Dec 85).....	 65
 Italians' Viewpoint on SDI, Geneva Detailed by PRAVDA (G. Zafesov; Moscow PRAVDA, 8 Jan 86).....	 68
 USSR's Zamyatin Compares U.S., Soviet Attitudes in Kuwaiti Paper (Leonid Zamyatin Interview; Kuwait AL-QABAS, 8 Jan 86).....	 71
 Briefs	
Soviet Arms Proposal	73
TASS Reports Plenary Meeting	73

RELATED ISSUES

USSR's Bovin Views Struggle Within U.S. on Foreign Policy (Aleksandr Bovin; Moscow Television Service, 31 Dec 85)....	74
--	----

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: SHULTZ TOUR OF W. EUROPE CONNECTED WITH SDI PARTICIPATION

'Additional Pressure'

LD102351 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1820 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] London, 10 Dec (TASS)--Talks took place here between UK Prime Minister Thatcher, and U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz who came to London for a 1-day visit. The head of the American foreign policy department's tour of a number of European countries started with a stopover in the British capital. During this tour he will, in particular, take part in a conference of NATO foreign ministers in Brussels.

As is pointed out in the statement issued by the prime minister's office, attention at the talks between M. Thatcher and Foreign Secretary G. Howe and G. Shultz was devoted to East-West relations in light of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva, the situation in the arms control field, the situation in the Near East, and bilateral Anglo-American relations.

However, as local observers point out, the so-called American "Strategic Defense Initiative," which is aimed at the militarization of space, was the main subject on the agenda of the consultations.

It is noted here that G. Shultz arrived in London only a few days after the British Conservative Government signed a "Memorandum on Mutual Understanding" with the Washington administration providing for Great Britain's participation in research work under the "Star Wars" program. In this connection, observers point out that the U.S. secretary of state is determined to use the memorandum's signing for bringing additional pressure to bear on the other West European countries with a view to making them 'follow' London's "example" and also join in the implementation of SDI.

At the conclusion of his talks here, G. Shultz maintained that the "Star Wars" program, with the help of which Washington counts on gaining decisive military-strategic advantage over the USSR... "will eliminate the threat" of a nuclear missile strike on Western Europe. At the same time, the secretary of state attempted to justify the U.S. Administration's dangerous plans with the mythical "Soviet threat."

Significant attention was devoted in G. Shultz' speech to the problem of "regional conflicts," which Washington is striving to use to achieve its own foreign political aims, above all, to suppress national liberation movements.

SDI Is 'Magic Wand'

LD111646 Moscow World Service in English 1400 GMT 11 Dec 85

[Yuriy Reshetnikov commentary on U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz's 6-nation European Tour]

[Text] George Shultz began his trip in Britain, where he launched a high-pitched campaign of salesmanship for American space-strike weapons. Specifically, he stressed the relevance of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative to Europe's security as being something of a magic wand that would allegedly avert the danger of a nuclear war. He contended that the latest advances in high technology make Washington's "star wars" program a natural choice over alternatives to prevent a nuclear conflict. As was expected on this trip, George Shultz renewed the United States' offer to allies to join in the research effort to produce required technology for space-strike weapons.

Last week, under pressure from Washington, the British Government was the first to cave in and become the first United States ally to sign an agreement with Washington to collaborate in President Reagan's multibillion dollar space-weapons program. The West German parliament was scheduled to begin debates Friday on whether to follow suit.

Apart from promising, supposedly, a surefire remedy against nuclear war in SDI, the United States is dangling before its allies the prospect of lucrative business deals to be derived from the program. With intense antiwar feelings in Western Europe coupled with high unemployment, the United States' offer would seem to find fertile soil, and yet with all that there seems a different reaction. Apart from Britain and [words indistinct] West Germany, Washington's allies have shown considerable apprehension with regard to the "star wars" plan. It is justifiably viewed in Europe as an attempt by the United States to secure a would-be shield for its own territory by drawing on the allies' scientific and technological resources while leaving Europe to its own devices.

That, however, is not the worst scenario. Top experts the world over envision a different course of events. Meeting this week in London, leading academics and scientists from 13 countries have concluded that President Reagan's "star wars" program would inevitably lead to a massive expansion of the nuclear arms race rather than make nuclear weapons obsolete as claimed by Washington. In a statement issued after a 4-day symposium the scientists said that the SDI would precipitate unrestrained competition in offensive and defensive weapons, unravelling the entire web of existing arms control agreements, increasing the chances of nuclear war and scandalously wasting the scientific, technological, and economic resources of most of the industrialized world.

With all the merits of free enterprise that George Shultz has been promoting on this trip, most of it is bound to be channeled toward making life on earth ever more precarious once the United States unleashes the arms race into space. And while there are so far no weapons in space, neither American nor Soviet, there is still time to clamp a tight lid on such weapons ever escaping into space, to pave the way for gradual disarmament here on earth.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET REPORTS, COMMENT ON FRG TALKS IN U.S. ON SDI

FRG's Bangemann Departs

LD112209 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0708 GMT 11 Jan 86

[Sergey Sosnovskiy report]

[Text] Bonn, 11 Jan (TASS)-- M. Bangemann, the FRG minister for economics, leaves for the United States today to hold talks with the U.S. Administration on the economic, technological, and legal details of participation by West German firms and concerns in the implementation of the sinister "star wars" program. This is an obvious step along the path of practical implementation of the decision adopted by the FRG Government at the end of last year to become involved in the program for the militarization of space according to Washington's scenario. The delegation, led by M. Bangemann, will meet G. Bush, the U.S. vice president; G. Shultz, the secretary of state; and C. Weinberger, the defense secretary.

As H. Kohl, the FRG chancellor, stated yesterday at a news conference in Bonn, his government fully supports the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative", and expects that very soon the framework of an appropriate agreement with the United States will be worked out. When H. Kohl was asked whether the FRG recognizes the negative consequences of participation in preparations for "star wars", and what it is that dictates Bonn's determined striving to take part in the implementation of this program, the head of government declined to give a direct answer, referring only to the "well-known position" of his government on this question.

Wishing to join in Washington's dangerous space adventure at all costs, Bonn disregards the demands of the public, of scientists, and of prominent FRG political figures, for renunciation of all participation in SDI. Numerous public opinion polls show that the majority of citizens of the FRG are opposed to the militarization of space and to FRG participation in a qualitatively new spiral of the arms race.

PRAVDA Cited on Talks

LD130839 Moscow TASS in English 0825 GMT 13 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 13 TASS -- "The owners of West Germany's military-industrial concerns are content, rubbing their hands gleefully: The government is meeting their wishes," Yuliy Yakhontov, Bonn correspondent for the newspaper PRAVDA, said in a comment, published in his paper today, on a visit to Washington by Martin Bangemann, West German economics minister and chairman of the Free Democratic Party, for talks on terms for his country's involvement in the American "Strategic Defense Initiative".

"Prominent Bonn politicians concerned with security issues are, the newspaper DIE WELT wrote, displeased that the talks have been entrusted to a man representing a party most of whose members disapprove of the militarization of outer space and of their country's involvement in that effort. This, however, is believed in local journalists circles to have been done on purpose, with account taken of the sentiments in the Free Democratic Party, to muffle the feelings of discontentment and alarm prevailing in broad sections of the country's population in connection with the future agreement."

"It is not a happenstance, therefore, that the list of assignments to be done by Bangemann says almost nothing of the 'Strategic Defense Initiative'," Yakhontov noted.

"It mostly speaks of the need to agree on 'better terms' for 'technological cooperation', access for West German firms to the whole spectrum of secret information gleaned in the course of research, copyright and other rights, in short anything but the FRG's participation in what is a most dangerous venture, the militarization of outer space."

"Public opinion in the Federal Republic of Germany is being shaped accordingly. Some papers openly say, for instance, that the government intends to conclude talks with the United States 'as soon as possible'. It is being hastened on by Franz-Josef Strauss, leader of Bavaria's right-wingers, who is believed here to have personal vested interests in the participation of some West German concerns in the SDI. Speaking in an interview with the selfsame DIE WELT, (which, incidentally, is also active in making the case for the SDI), T. Hefer, a member of the Bundestag known for his reactionary views, was eager to intimidate the readers: If Bonn fails to sign an agreement with Washington 'in the immediate future', he said, this will allegedly have 'the gravest consequences' for West Germany's security."

Talks Begin

LD132308 Moscow TASS in English 2246 GMT 13 Jan 86

[Text] Washington, January 13 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Vladislav Legantsov.

A West German delegation led by Economics Minister Martin Bangemann has started talks here on conditions of Bonn's participation in the American "star wars" programme.

The delegation met with U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger, Secretary of State George Shultz, Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige and other officials. A meeting between Bangemann and U.S. Vice-President George Bush is on schedule too.

The Reagan administration is pressing the West German Government into assuming an official commitment under which West Germany's scientific and industrial potential would be placed at the Pentagon's disposal for implementing the dangerous plans of militarizing outer space.

According to U.S. Under Secretary of Defence for Policy Fred Ikle, the American side intends to consider at talks with the West German delegation the question of concluding an agreement similar to the cooperation accord already signed between the United States and Britain. The Anglo-American agreement sets out general rules to guide British industrial companies, universities and research institutes in concluding contracts with the Washington administration on work within the framework of developing an ABM system with partially space-based elements.

THE WASHINGTON TIMES newspaper, commenting on the beginning of the American-West German talks, observes that the Washington administration needs an official agreement between the two countries in order to demonstrate approval for Ronald Reagan's Strategic Defence Initiative" by American NATO allies.

FRG's Strauss, Ruehl Cited

LD142055 Moscow TASS in English 1756 GMT 14 Jan 86

[Text] Bonn, January 14 TASS -- The purpose of U.S.-West German talks which have opened in Washington is to reach accord on West Germany's participation in the SDI on a governmental basis, which means that the sides should not stop at reaching agreement only on West German companies' contribution to the project, Franz-Josef Strauss, chairman of the Christian Social Union, said in an interview to SUEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG. According to the newspaper, the Bavarian prime minister urged the West German delegation to the talks to concentrate primarily on the military interests of West Germany, which should assume a "special responsibility" as regards participation in SDI from the point of view of "security policy"

Similar calls are coming from the West German Defence Ministry. Echoing Strauss, Lothar Ruehl, secretary of state at the Bonn Defence Ministry, pointed out in the military-political journal LOYAL that the West German Government would not avoid a role in financing SDI, which actually presupposes West Germany's participation in the "star wars" programme on a governmental rather than private basis.

These statements show that the "star wars" advocated in West Germany consider earlier decision on SDI merely as a start and believe that West Germany should contribute more substantially to the American "star wars" plans. They have launched a massive propaganda campaign to boost West Germany's contribution to SDI. Enjoying the support of the West German Military-industrial complex, those "advocates" are stepping up pressure on Bonn in a bid further to involve the country in another, far more dangerous round of the nuclear arms race.

FRG Public Concerned

LD160048 Moscow TASS in English 2045 GMT 15 Jan 86

[Excerpt] Bonn, 15 Jan (TASS)--TASS correspondent Gennadiy Kulbitskiy reports:

Serious concern of the FRG's democratic public has been evoked by the results of the voyage to Washington by Martin Bangemann, the federal minister of economics, who held talks in Washington on the participation of West German firms in the implementation of the United States sinister plans to militarise the outer space. The results of the minister's trip confirmed that Bonn is prepared to continue giving every support to the criminal designs of the U.S. Administration in the preparation of "star wars".

The DPA news agency reported that the very first round of the talks in Washington on involving the FRG in Washington's space venture has achieved a concrete result. Arrangement was made that another group of experts will arrive in Washington in January to study concrete details of the participation of West German firms in the research in the framework of the so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative".

Moreover, the minister supposes that partial arrangement on the matter might be reached already late in March -- early in April of the current year.

FRG Trade Union Declaration

LD132353 Moscow TASS in English 2100 GMT 13 Jan 86

[Text] Bonn, January 13 TASS -- A number of district trade union organisations whose conferences are held in the Federal Republic of Germany these days declared in support of the Soviet peace initiatives, against the U.S. "star wars" plans and participation of the FRG in them.

We welcome the moratorium on all nuclear explosions announced unilaterally by the Soviet Union and we expect that the United States and other nuclear powers will follow that example so that the talks on concluding a comprehensive test ban treaty could end successfully, says a resolution adopted at a district conference of the Union of Workers in Trade, Banks and Insurance Institutions that was held in Minden.

The participants in the conference urged the FRG Government to give up direct or indirect participation in the implementation of the "star wars" programme, to refuse the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in the FRG territory and demanded that Bonn enter talks on the creation of nuclear-free and chemical weapon-free zones in Europe.

A district conference of the Union of Workers in the Printing and Paper Industry, held in Bielefeld, assessed the "star wars" plans as part of the aggressive military strategy of the Pentagon that serves the aims of the United States hegemonistic policy and egoistic interests of U.S. war corporations. The participants in the conference urged the FRG Government to give up participation in these plans.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1228

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW: U.S. 'SUBVERTING' ABM TREATY WITH AMENDMENTS

LD091133 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 9 Dec 85

[Boris Andrianov commentary]

[Text] Foreign observers focus attention on the memorandum on an accord, signed in London last Friday, on British participation in the implementation of the U.S. Star Wars program. They make special note of statement by the Pentagon chief, Weinberger, that the antimissile defense system with space-based elements might protect not only the United States but also West Europe.

The statement by the head of the U.S. war department is most eloquent. For apart from anything else, he effectively admits that Washington is not even considering renouncing its intention to continue its course of subverting the treaty signed in 1972 between the Soviet Union and United States on limitation of ABM systems. Across the ocean, they have long ago begun to undermine that document, which originally reflected an understanding by both states of the need to renounce the deployment [razvertyvaniye] of any large-scale ABM system. And lately, official representatives of the Washington administration have been increasingly insisting that allegedly, the treaty should be amended.

In this connection, it is appropriate to recall that amendments have already been made to the treaty. That was in 1974, and at that time the amendments were seen by the world public as an important step toward strengthening international stability. How else could one regard the protocol signed at that time in Moscow on the treaty on ABM, since it envisioned in particular a reduction in the areas of siting [razmeshcheniye] ABM systems from two to one per side, and there was a corresponding halving of the number of permitted launch pads and anti-missile defenses of the USSR and United States, from 200 to 100.

But now Washington is advocating amendments of a quite different kind. In the designs of the U.S. Administration, the new amendments to the treaty are to lead to a complete revision of that major document, and legalize militarization of space and give a semblance of legality to Washington's plans which amount to an intention to deploy [razvernut] antimissile defense with space-based elements.

Our country is keeping strictly to its commitments under the ABM treaty and is meticulously observing the spirit and letter of that major document which is a barrier on the road to the strategic arms race. The Soviet Union considers it impermissible to embark on an erosion of the treaty, and even more so to cast doubt on the prospects of its existence.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1228

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET GENERAL DETAILS U.S. ABM TREATY VIOLATIONS

PM011530 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Jan 86 Second Edition p 3

[Major General V. Obinyakov article: "Treaties Must be Observed"]

[Text] The principle of conscientious discharge of international obligations (pacta sunt servanda, which means that treaties must be observed) has been known since ancient times. It is enshrined in the UN Charter. It is also often cited by the United States. But citing is one thing, and execution is something quite different.

Last week the White House reported to Congress: "The United States fully complies with its pledges and promises in the arms control sphere." Such a statement imposes great obligations. In any case, one would have thought that it should be a responsible and trustworthy statement. But the White House is either not kept up to date regarding the real state of affairs in the implementation of agreements or, when speaking of "fully" complying with its pledges, it has in mind only pledges which do not prevent the United States from implementing its military programs.

For example, how is this statement to be reconciled with the SDI program, within whose framework a large-scale ABM system is being developed [razrabatyvatsya], in view of the fact that the creation [sozdaniye] of this system's space-based elements is already directly contrary to Article V of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the limitation of ABM system? How is it to be reconciled with the United States' actions on the creation [sozdaniye] of mobile ABM radar stations and multiple-charge warheads for antimissiles, which are banned by that treaty?

The aforementioned White House document says that the United States observes not only ABM Treaty but also obligations in connection with the SALT II Treaty. However, in 1983 it started the deployment of its new Pershing-2 missiles and land-based cruise missiles in an attempt to destroy step by step the very foundation of this treaty -- the strategic balance between the Soviet Union and the United States enshrined in its articles and clauses. There is only one conclusion that can be drawn from this -- the stepping up of U.S. strategic potential by means of the medium-range nuclear missiles being deployed in Europe is nothing but an attempt to evade the SALT II treaty, in other words to perform an action prohibited by its Article XII.

The list of such instances can be extended. We will, however, dwell on just one, which -- obviously not by accident -- has not been covered by the Western press. The issue concerns the deployment of a large radar station in Greenland by the United States.

Official U.S. documents like, for example, Defense Secretary C. Weinberger's report to Congress on the Draft Military Budget for fiscal 1986, mention as a routine development that the installation of a new radar station in Thule (Greenland) will be completed in 1986 and that major modernization of the radar station in Fylingdales (Britain) will begin. According to Pentagon statements, they both are radar stations for early warning of a missile attack. The station due to be deployed in Thule has phased-array antenna, similar to those at the pave paws radar stations deployed on U.S. territory.

In reality, however, the deployment of a large phased-array radar station outside U.S. territory is a far from routine development. Those who are familiar with the provisions of the ABM Treaty would immediately ask the legitimate question whether Washington's actions are in line with the pledges it has given.

Such radar stations can be used for various purposes, including ABM defense purposes. This is why they were the object of particular attention by the sides during the ABM Treaty's elaboration. The unlimited deployment of such stations could be perceived by the other side as an attempt to get round the treaty and lay foundations for the deployment of an ABM defense of the country's territory. This is why the sides pledged not to deploy large phased-array radar stations, apart from within a designated region, at test ranges, and "along the periphery of its national territory and oriented outward" (Article III, IV, and VI of the treaty), or for any other purpose than the tracking of objects in space or the use as national technical means for verification. The deployment of such stations beyond this framework, including outside U.S. territory, is prohibited.

Thus the large U.S. phased-array radar station in Greenland breaches simultaneously two obligations undertaken by the United States in connection with the ABM Treaty -- Article VI of the treaty, and the provision contained in section I(a), subparagraph F, of the White House document sent to the U.S. Congress 13 June 1972.

The Western press is promoting the idea that the Thule project supposedly does not involve the deployment of a new radar station at all, but only the modernization of an old one. But even Pentagon spokesmen speak of this radar station as a new one. For example, the statement by the Under secretary of defense for research and engineering to the U.S. Congress concerning [the budget for] fiscal 1986 openly mentions that "the replacement of conventional radar stations built 20 years ago with a new phased-array radar station based on solid-state elements is underway in Thule (Greenland)."

Facts show that one modern phased-array radar station is being deployed in Thule instead of the previously existing four old radar stations with conventional antennas. The potential of this new station is many times greater than the potential of large radar stations as defined by the ABM Treaty. Claims that all this falls within the term "modernization" are, to say the least, frivolous. Moreover, these claims run counter to the very idea of limiting large phased-array radar stations. Back in the past, when the Soviet side raised no objection to the fact that, as an exception, the U.S. side left some of its early warning radar stations, including some stations beyond U.S. territory, outside the limitations framework, it proceeded from the fact that those were not phased-array radar stations and could not acquire an ABM potential in the future. The same criterion applied to some radar stations in the Soviet Union.

The "building of a new U.S. radar stations at Fylingdales" (Britain) would also be an obvious violation of the ABM Treaty.

The treaty on the limitation of ABM Systems constitutes the basis for the entire current treaty system which is restraining the arms race. At the same time, it is the foundation on which all future accords in the sphere of strategic offensive weapons could be built. In compliance with the ABM Treaty's provisions, Washington ought to stop the construction of the radar station in Greenland and abandon the construction of such a radar station in Britain.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly declared, including at the highest level, that it firmly advocates the preservation of all Soviet-U.S. accords and their strict observance. In line with the constitution, our country builds its relations with other countries on the basis of "conscientious discharge of obligations stemming from universally recognized principles and norms of international law, including international treaties concluded by the Soviet Union." This is one of the fundamental principles of the foreign policy implemented by the Soviet Union. It is rigorously observed.

Bearing in mind the great importance for the cause of peace of Soviet-U.S. agreements in the sphere of the limitation and reduction of strategic arms and other treaty documents aimed at enhancing the security of the peoples, we are entitled to expect from the U.S. side a conscientious discharge of its obligations not in words but in deeds.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1228

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: CONGRESSMAN CRITICIZES U.S. INTERPRETATION OF ABM TREATY

LD022033 Moscow TASS in English 1905 GMT 2 Jan 86

[Text] Washington, 2 Jan (TASS)--Washington's attempts to "interpret in a new way" the 1972 Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the limitation of anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, the treaty which prohibits the development, testing and deployment of ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based, are "legally unsound and diplomatically untenable." This was said by U.S. Congressman Dante Fascell (Democrat, Florida).

The congressman recalled that the first such attempt had been made by former Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Robert McFarlane. D. Fascell noted that his statement had had a provocative nature, since the high representative of the administration radically altered the interpretation of the treaty to which all the U.S. Administration adhered from the time of its signing. The congressman stressed that the new interpretation of the agreement would permit the development and testing of any sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based ABM systems "right up to the point of final deployment." The administration's assertions that "a broader interpretation" of the agreement is "legally justifiable," mean an attempt to get an opportunity for subsequent changes of the treaty. D. Fascell noted particularly that the existing treaty suits the best both the interests of the United States national security and the arms control process.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1228

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET COMMENTARY ON U.S. LASER RESEARCH

Shows Offensive Capability

LD131132 Moscow TASS in English 1112 GMT 13 Jan 86

[Text] San Francisco, January 13 TASS -- Laser weapons being developed in the USA as part of the "star wars" program are offensive weapons capable of destroying a large city or even the population centres of a whole country within a matter of hours, the LOS ANGELES TIMES says in an article quoting the findings of a study done recently by California's R and D Associates. The findings of the authors of that study are backed by physicist Caroline L. Herzenberger, who contributed an article to the latest issue of the physics and society journal published by the American Physical Society.

"High-intensity laser light from such weapons could also be used offensively to unleash massive fire storms, possibly producing an environmental disaster similar to a 'nuclear winter'," the newspaper says. According to it, lasers can be used against enemy conventional forces.

"Mass fires might be expected to generate smoke in amounts comparable to the amounts generated in some major nuclear exchange scenarios," Herzenberger says. The study done by R and D Associates also points out that lasers could be used offensively to incinerate enemy cities.

Seeks 'Military Edge'

LD141323 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 14 Jan 86

[Text] A defense research organization based in the Los Angeles suburb of Marina del Rey says that lasers designed for use in the "star wars" program could become a potent offensive weapon. A study this organization, R and D Associates, has circulated among government scientists points out that a laser defense system powerful enough to cope with the ballistic missile threat can also destroy the enemy's major cities by fire. The attack, it says, would proceed city by city, the attack time for each city being only a matter of minutes. Not nuclear destruction, say the authors of the study, (Albert L. Lattern) and (Ernest A. Martinelli), but Armageddon all the same.

The two scientists warn that the lasers can be employed in a manner not contemplated, both as a shield against nuclear missiles and as an offensive weapon against targets on earth, but both ways hold out tremendous dangers for all humanity. Development of an antimissile space umbrella means adding to the nuclear stocks in the hands of the United States what is needed to change the balance of strength and give the United States a military edge and therefore, the potential to deliver a nuclear strike with impunity.

Needless to say, in the event, the Soviet Union would have to take the proper retaliatory measures to guarantee its own security and the security of its allies. If the United States brings its Strategic Defense Initiative to realization this can only lead to strategic chaos: The arms race will move into a new stage and get out of control in all areas, not only in nuclear weapons.

Another source of public worry is the increased danger of an accidental outbreak of war if weapons are put in space. After all, the most sophisticated laser, nuclear, and other computer-controlled weapons systems would be deployed right over the heads of people. Who can guarantee that a fault might not develop that would lead to a catastrophe? Even the present-day less sophisticated computers develop faults.

American scientists also note that massive fires triggered by the lasers might generate smoke in amounts comparable to the amounts generated in some major nuclear exchange scenarios. This warning was issued by Caroline L. Herzenberger, a physicist at the Oregon National Laboratory near Chicago. Her article appears in the current issue of PHYSICS AND SOCIETY a publication of the American Physical Society. These massive fires, she says, could cause a climatic catastrophe similar to a nuclear winter.

Yes, there are many reasons why space must serve none but peaceful purposes and benefit all nations. It must be kept free from weapons and steps to this end must be taken at once before it is too late, before the world witnesses what scientists warn of.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1228

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA: GO-AHEAD GIVEN TO U.S. ARMS RACE 'EXPANSION'

PM181200 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Dec 85 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Gan dispatch: "Blessing the Arms Race"]

[Text] Washington, 17 Dec--Under administration pressure the U.S. legislature has given the "go-ahead" for the further expansion of spending on the arms race. The congressional conference committee today approved the draft bill on the allocation of the unprecedented sum of 298.7 billion dollars for specific defense department programs in the current fiscal 1986.

The draft bill stipulates, in particular, the allocation of 1.7 billion dollars for the construction of another 12 MX first-strike ICBM's. More than 2 billion dollars will go on the creation of the D-5 ICBM for Trident II submarines. Over 50 billion dollars are earmarked for the production of 48 B-1 strategic bombers.

Ignoring the calls from the expanding movement of opponents of the militarization of space, the committee approved the almost doubling in comparison with last year--from 1.4 to 2.75 billion dollars--of the funds for the expedited implementation of the "star wars" program. This step has been greeted with rejoicing in the country by those who are dying to create space strike weapons. The WASHINGTON POST reports that the program's leaders are now planning to accelerate the tests of nuclear devices which it is planned to put into low earth orbit.

The legislators' decision to introduce a moratorium on Pentagon testing of the ASAT antisatellite system can be seen as the sole concession to public demands. However, this measure was fiercely criticized by Defense Secretary C. Weinberger, who accused congress of all the deadly sins--from making "concessions to the Soviet Union" to "undermining arms control and U.S. national security." The importance of the ban was immediately reduced by the resolution on starting up production of a fundamentally new type of chemical weapon--binary charges. Some 126 million dollars are being allocated for this purpose in the current fiscal year. And the legislators made the stipulation that toxic munitions can be produced from 1 October only after the European NATO allies have agreed to site the weapons on their territories. Taking account of the Pentagon "art" of twisting the West Europeans' arms, that stipulation can hardly be considered serious.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1231

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR'S PONOMAREV ON CPSU PROGRAM, ARMS RACE

PM091725 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 29 Dec 85 pp 1-2

[Account of speech by B.N. Ponomarev, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at a 28 December Vilnius City report-and-election party conference]

[Excerpts] The party's pregress documents open up an inspiring prospect for the Land of the Soviets and the Soviet people. They are hailed and warmly approved by the fraternal parties and by progressive, democratic, peace-loving forces abroad.

These documents combine the theoretical elaboration of ways to improve socialist society with the tasks of preventing nuclear war.

The recent USSR Supreme Soviet session adopted the plan for the USSR's socio-economic development for the coming year and a resolution on the results of the Geneva summit meeting, which essentially contains the Soviet peace plan.

Comrades! In our time questions of war and peace have assumed particularly great significance, and the minds and hearts of millions of people throughout the world are riveted on them. The CPSU and the Soviet Union are waging a titanic battle for peace of worldwide-historic significance. The actual situation is such that at the present time — in the nuclear age — it is a question not only of confrontation between the two social systems — socialism and capitalism — but also of a choice between mankind's survival and mutual destruction.

Two diametrically opposite concepts for resolving the historical dispute between the two systems have long existed in world politics.

On one side of the watershed are forces which hope to settle this dispute by means of intensifying confrontation and the arms race. These are the most reactionary, aggressive circles of imperialism — above all, U.S. imperialism. In many Western countries it is precisely these circles that now control the economic might, the armed forces, the state apparatus, and the vast propaganda machine. Their ultimate aim is to block the development of revolutionary processes in the world and, where possible, to achieve the defeat of revolutionary forces and take social revenge. Precisely this is at the bottom of the policy of maintaining international tension and accelerating the creation [sozdaniye] of new types of weapons with monstrous power, the policy of militarizing space.

An analysis of the international situation led the CPSU to the conclusion that the danger of the outbreak of a world nuclear war has increased. This is why the CPSU declares most forcefully in the draft new edition of the Program: "There is no loftier and more responsible mission than that of defending and strengthening peace and curbing the forces of aggression and militarism in the name of the life of the present and future generations."

The CPSU believes that mankind is at a turning point in world development: Either the arms race will be halted and things will move toward the lessening of the threat of war and the improvement of the whole world political climate, or the upper hand will be gained by forces which are continuing to fuel tension and are accelerating the arms race, thereby drawing mankind closer to nuclear catastrophe.

Imperialism's aggressive policy is countered by the active, consistently peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union and the socialist states and by their growing economic and defense might. The achievement of military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO plays a tremendous role in maintaining peace. This has overturned the calculations of imperialism's aggressive circles as to the possibility of winning a world nuclear war, strengthened the positions of all progressive forces, and created a real guarantee of international security. The CEMA session at the level of heads of government of the CEMA countries and the meeting of central committee secretaries of the socialist community countries' fraternal parties, which have just been held, demonstrated once again the cohesion and strength of real socialism, its outstanding role in the international arena, and the unbending will to defend the chief right of all people — the right to life.

The policy of aggression and militarism is also opposed by the overwhelming majority of young liberated states. The broadest people's masses are rising to the struggle against the danger of war. More and more sober-minded politicians even in capitalist countries are coming to realize the danger of the policy of war preparations and the arms race.

Our party once again proclaims to the whole world that the only acceptable policy in our time full of contradictions is peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems. And it will firmly and consistently uphold this principle and help to assert it in international relations.

The draft new edition of the Program contains our party's clearly expressed will to work constructively in all avenues of the struggle to improve the international situation. It emphasizes the desire to normalize relations with the United States, to develop good-neighborliness and cooperation among European states, and to extend detente to the whole world. Attaching great political significance to states' cooperation in the economic, scientific, technical, and cultural spheres, the CPSU advocates the development of broad stable ties in these spheres.

The all-embracing and constructive proposals advanced by the CPSU for the purpose of curbing the arms race are expressed in the solemn formula: "There is no weapon that the Soviet Union would not be prepared to limit or ban on a reciprocal basis, given effective monitoring."

Of course, the USSR is ready for this on the principles of equality and identical security, that is, without detriment to its own security and that of its allies. This is why the Program formulates another important conclusion associated with this: The Soviet state does not seek to achieve military superiority, but neither will it permit the established military-strategic equilibrium to be upset, at the same time trying to ensure that the level of this equilibrium is steadily reduced.

Our policy in the sphere of defense and security, and Soviet military doctrine, as the Program points out, are of a strictly defensive nature. It is proposed to maintain the Armed Forces at a level which rules out imperialism's strategic superiority, protects Soviet people's peaceful labor, and stands in the way of aggressive designs.

The April plenum indicated the need to activate our peace-loving policy on the broadest range of most vitally important international problems. It was deemed necessary and urgent to do everything in order to halt and reverse the arms race and to return the development of international relations to the tracks of detente. "...The development of world events," Comrade M.S. Gorbachev emphasized at the USSR Supreme Soviet session, "has reached the point where particularly crucial decisions are demanded, where inaction or delay in acting are criminal, because today we are talking about the preservation of civilization and of life itself."

Following the April plenum, the USSR advanced major new peace-loving initiatives. Major new actions were undertaken in addition to the unilateral steps taken earlier, namely the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and not to place antisatellite weapons in space: A moratorium was imposed on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe, and nuclear explosions were halted.

It is well known that the United States responded to these initiatives of ours with a series of new nuclear explosions, tests of antisatellite weapons, acceleration of the implementation of Reagan's "star wars" program, and the involvement of the NATO allies in this program.

None of this, however, shook the Soviet Union's determination to achieve a breakthrough in the dangerous development of international relations. There followed an important new proposal which was coordinated with our allies — to reduce strategic nuclear means by one-half on condition that the development [razrabotka] of space strike weapons is banned. It was also proposed to resolve separately the question of medium-range nuclear weapons, and the number of our SS-20 missiles in the European zone was unilaterally reduced. Once again, the United

States responded by continuing the deployment of its missiles in West Europe and conducting operational tests of Pershing-2 missiles on the U.S. West Coast. The purpose of our initiatives is well known: to open the way toward breaking the vicious circles of the arms race, terminating it on earth, and preventing it in space. Reciprocity, however, has not been forthcoming from the United States.

The Soviet Union combines firm resistance to the U.S. course of breaking the military-strategic parity with a considered and constructive approach to the most acute problems of peace and security, and with the promotion of a far-reaching and specific peace-loving program.

It was this program that the Soviet side took to the Geneva summit meeting. The Geneva meeting became a major political event in international life. Now it is recognized everywhere that the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting was both necessary and useful at a time when mankind faces the choice between survival and the danger of annihilation. The results of the meeting offer opportunities for moving away from a state of dangerous confrontation to a constructive quest for ways to establish proper [korrektnyy] relations between our two countries, and for improving the international climate as a whole.

Very great importance is attached to the mutual understanding reached between the USSR and U.S. leaders and expressed in the final document: That a nuclear war must never be fought and that there can be no victors in such a war. Fundamental importance is also attached to recognition of the need to prevent any war between the USSR and the United States, and to the stipulation that neither side will seek military superiority.

It is our belief that, if one is to be consistent, practical conclusions ought to follow on from these fundamental accords: rejection of the doctrines of waging "limited" or "total" nuclear wars or any wars at all between the opposed military-political alliances. The rejection of the pursuit of military superiority registered in Geneva logically demands that the arms race be halted and that the level of military-strategic parity be consistently reduced. This understanding is what determines our approach to the practical implementation of the accords reached in Geneva.

Reagan's persistence in upholding the "star wars" program prevented the finding of a solution to the most important questions of terminating the arms race. It is well known that the meeting has not led to a reduction of the quantity of weapons in the world, nor has it halted the arms race. But we do attach importance to Geneva's confirmation of the mutual accord reached in January 1985 on the subject and objectives of Soviet-U.S. talks. It is well known that, at that time, the Soviet-U.S. joint statement enshrined the sides' agreement that the objective of their talks would be to prevent an arms race in space and terminate it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear weapons, and to strengthen strategic stability.

The accord reached with Reagan on the acceleration of these talks is also important. In the Soviet side's view, the talks can yield practical results giving the political will to translate fine statements into real agreements, on condition that the principle of equality and identical security is observed.

Accords were also reached in Geneva on some questions of the development of Soviet-U.S. bilateral cooperation. It seems that they can provide a suitable basis for raising the level of trust between our countries and peoples. Agreement was reached on the continuation of USSR-U.S. political contacts, and primarily of summit meetings.

The Geneva meeting, as the CPSU Central Committee Politburo noted when examining its results, was a major political event of international life. The Geneva accords are capable of exerting a positive influence on changing the political and psychological climate in contemporary international relations and on the latter's improvement, and of reducing the threat of the outbreak of nuclear war. The peoples of the world link with Geneva's results their hopes for the revival of detente and the consolidation of the principle of peaceful coexistence in international relations.

While assessing the Geneva meeting positively on the whole, one cannot fail to perceive that, in view of the stance taken by the U.S. side, it still did not produce everything that the peoples expected from it. It did not produce an answer to the main question perturbing all people on the planet: Will there be real progress along the path of reducing arms, or will the prospect of curbing the arms race be thwarted by the militarization of space? It has to be said that, at Geneva and even after it, everyone heard the U.S. President's words about peace. All of mankind, however, including our own people, expect good deeds. And it is for these deeds that a new battle is in progress. The key issues in it are: prevention of the militarization of space; termination of all nuclear tests; the banning of chemical weapons; and reduction and liquidation of medium-range missiles in Europe.

The main point now is to ensure that the next summit meeting produces specific results in the business of reducing arms, and primarily nuclear arms, on earth and not allowing them in space.

This is now the goal of our leadership's energetic efforts.

The most reactionary circles in the United States, and the mass news media which sing in tune with them, have launched a malicious attack on the Geneva results. A campaign has been launched to discredit the accords reached at the Geneva meeting, against the normalization of relations with the USSR, and against the establishment and consolidation of mutual trust in Soviet-U.S. relations. Attempts to undermine the Geneva accords are also being made by representatives of the highest echelon [vysshiy eshelon] of power in the United States.

Despite the readiness proclaimed by Reagan in Geneva to help accelerate the talks with the USSR on questions linked with ending the arms race, the U.S. side is not taking any specific steps in this direction. Meanwhile, war preparations are intensifying in the United States. An enormous military budget has been approved for 1986 — about \$300 billion, with expenditure on the implementation of the "star wars" plans rising by 80 percent. Programs for the creation [sozdaniye] of MX and Midgetman missiles, Trident submarines, and B-1 bombers are in full swing. The question of the U.S. refusal to observe the ABM and SALT II Treaties remains in abeyance.

The Soviet Union treats the Geneva accords with utmost gravity. It demonstrates by deeds its agreement to go its own part of the way toward achieving reliable, reciprocal security and peaceful cooperation with the United States. The USSR is prepared, in the spirit of honest collaboration with the United States, to seek an end to the arms race, given its prevention in space, and the improvement of the situation in the world. The Soviet side has advanced an important initiative in this direction, even since Geneva: The readiness to extend the term of the nuclear explosions moratorium introduced by the Soviet Union provided the United States reciprocates has been reaffirmed. A positive response by the U.S. Administration to this proposal of ours could open the way to a final ban in treaty form on all nuclear weapon tests.

The system of measures to terminate the arms race and improve the international atmosphere as a whole which was proposed by the Soviet Union during the period of preparation for the Geneva meeting and at the meeting itself generated a wide and positive response all over the world. It was unanimously supported by our Warsaw Pact allies. The well known joint statements by the leaders of six countries — Argentina, Mexico, Tanzania, India, Sweden, and Greece — are in many respects in harmony with it. It has received support from fraternal communist parties, major international and national public movements and organizations, many internationally renowned scientists, and eminent politicians and military figures in Western countries. It has been received positively on the whole by the majority of parties belonging to the Socialist International. During the preparation and holding of the Geneva meeting many millions of people of the most varied political beliefs expressed publicly in different forms their will for the preservation and strengthening of peace and for a return to detente. We are justified in crediting our constructive peace policy with recent convincing demonstrations of a commitment to peace by practically the entire world community. What I have in mind are the results of the UN General Assembly's discussion of two issues: the prevention of an arms race in space, and the termination and banning of nuclear weapon tests. On the first of these questions the U.S. delegation found itself in complete isolation, while on the second it was joined only by the British and French delegations.

All this, comrades, demonstrates the enormous popularity of the USSR's peace-loving positions, and raised even higher our country's prestige in the international arena.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1231

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA: CONGRESS SHOWS 'UNPREDICTABLE CONSEQUENCES' OF SDI

PM081356 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 85 First Edition pp 1, 5

[Unnamed "own correspondent" report under the "International Information" rubric and the general heading "Dangerous Race"]

[Text] Washington, 6 Dec--The veil concealing from Americans the truth about the scale and consequences of the adventurist "star wars" program is gradually beginning to be lifted.

Materials of the hearings on the administration's so-called "strategic defense initiative" have been made public in the U.S. Congress. The legislators were addressed by, among others, former defense secretaries R. MacNamara and C. Clifford and arms control specialists (Dzh.) Rhinelanders, T. Longstretch, and (Dzh. Payk).

As a statement by D. Fascell, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, notes, the hearings established that the cost of the "star wars" program is simply phenomenal: the research work alone will cost \$33 billion over 6 years while the actual deployment of the space system will run into many trillions of dollars.

But this is only the financial aspect of the most dangerous venture of those who thirst for military and political hegemony on earth and in space. The participants in the hearings expressed far greater concern at the Pentagon "star wars" lobbyists' actions aimed at undermining the Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty. Nevertheless, the Congress documents point out, the "ABM Treaty is of fundamental significance for preventing the arms race in space and curbing it on earth." Despite the administration's assurances to abide by the existing interpretation of the treaty, D. Fascell notes for his part, the Pentagon is still trying to weaken this agreement and circumvent both the spirit and the letter of it, in other words, to undermine it.

Judging by his statement, the speakers at the hearings were unanimous that if the "star wars" program is implemented it will be fraught with unpredictable consequences for peace and the security of the whole planet.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1228

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW TV ON ASTEC MEETING, MILITARY MONOPOLIES, SDI

LD160028 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 15 Dec 85

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Tomas Kolesnichenko]

[Text] Hello, comrades! The last week has been distinguished by intensive political activity. Many delegations visited Moscow and meetings, talks, and negotiations took place. They merit attention, too, because the reflected light of the Soviet-U.S. summit negotiations in Geneva has been cast over them, as it were. They have once again confirmed that cooperation between people, peoples and states with differing social orders and differing ideologies is wholly possible--further, is essential. This is indeed an achievement of that great science discussed at Geneva--the science of living together on earth and of getting along with one another. A CBS television correspondent, for example, frankly stressed that the arrival in Moscow of U.S. Commerce Secretary Baldrige and of 400 businessmen representing over 230 U.S. firms had become possible only as a result of the Geneva spirit.

There is, however, a very influential force in that same U.S. business--the military-industrial complex, monopolies which have a dangerous influence on policy. They have long been called merchants of death since they operate on war and have an interest in the arms race, in creating increasingly new and more destructive weapons. This yields them huge profits. On the political level, however, such a course signifies an effort to undermine the principle of equality and mutual security which should be the basis of Soviet-U.S. relations.

The so-called Strategic Defense Initiative--in other words the "star wars" program to which the United States is giving birth--can be described as a classic example of attempts to attain military strategic superiority. We are told this is a defense, a shield. But one does not need to be a historian to know that in past ages a shield was used not only in defense, but also by those on the offensive. The armor of a tank, for instance, is also for defense, but who would describe a tank as a defensive weapon? Thus it is with the SDI program. What is involved here, of course, is putting a strike weapon into space, a first-strike weapon. No verbal dodges can conceal this fact. Many people in the United States itself understand this, too. Unfortunately, however, Washington does not heed such as they. An enormous feeding trough is being built there for the monopolies of the military-industrial complex. In 30 years, orders worth a total of approximately--approximately, for no one has reckoned it exactly as yet--a trillion dollars. For the next 5 years

tens of thousands of millions of dollars have already been assigned and the military monopolies are already swarming round this smell of roast meat--a term used by U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT--in pursuit of profitable orders.

It is primarily the Pentagon which is giving them patronage and the Pentagon boss Weinberger, that same Weinberger who sent a letter after U.S. President Reagan when the latter left for Geneva in which he in effect tried to torpedo the Geneva meeting. Weinberger is now conducting a line towards sabotaging what was achieved in Geneva. How else can one describe his efforts to cast aspersions against the Soviet Union which, to quote him, is violating the SALT II agreement, and so on and so forth. Yet only 3 weeks have elapsed since the Geneva meeting ended.

In general, one cannot say of the Pentagon that its right hand does not know what the left is doing. Both of its hands are busy: One is trying to sabotage the Geneva process; the other, inside the country, is giving fodder to the military monopolies and stepping up the militarization of the economy.

A specific example of this is the plan to set up a new military base in the center of New York, largest city in the United States, with a multi-million population. But how do the New Yorkers themselves react to this plan?

/8309

CSO: 5200/1231

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: UK'S HAMBLETON HEADS SDI RESEARCH COOPERATION

LD112217 Moscow TASS in English 1931 GMT 11 Dec 85

["Britain's Preparations for the Participation in the SDI"--TASS headline]

[Text] London, 11 Dec (TASS)--It has been announced here that Ken Hambleton, a high-ranking official of the British Defense Ministry, will head the special department set up there which will be in charge of Britain's participation in the research and development work within the framework of the so-called U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative. At present he is staying in Washington where he together with his "colleagues" from the Pentagon is looking into details of the British-American cooperation in the implementation of the plans of creating a large-scale anti-ballistic missile system with space-based elements.

The appointment of Ken Hambleton to this post came several days after the signing in London of the British-American "memorandum on mutual understanding" which provides for the participation of Britain in the implementation of the "star wars" program. It is also noteworthy that the appointment practically coincided in time with the stay in the British capital of the U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz who is touring Western Europe with the aim to make other U.S. partners by the NATO bloc follow the example of London and join in the implementation of the SDI.

/8309

CS0: 5200/1228

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: SDI RESEARCH CONTINUES; AMERICANS' CONCERN GROWS

PM171408 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 15 Dec 85 p 3

[TASS report: "Expedited Pace"]

[Text] Washington, 14 Dec--The United States is continuing to implement at an expedited pace the "strategic defensive initiative" (SDI) aimed at putting the latest types of strike arms into space.

Within the framework of the "star wars" program the USAF has placed in low earth orbit two artificial satellites which will serve as targets for the latest test of the ASAT system antisatellite missile.

At the Pentagon's Maxwell Laboratory in California another component of the planned system for ABM defense with space-based elements--an "electromagnetic cannon"--has been tested. ABC TV reports that a plastic cube weighing around 100 g was fired at a speed of over 96,000 km per hour using an electric charge. J. Faber, a representative of the nuclear defense administration, claims that this device should be more effective than particle beam weapons.

According to the WASHINGTON POST, the Pentagon has urgently requested an additional 100 million dollars to accelerate the program of underground nuclear tests directly linked with the creation of the so-called "space shield."

The preparations for the large-scale militarization of space are causing mounting alarm among an increasing number of sober-minded Americans. As the eminent scientist M. Shulman, director of the Harriman Institute of the Advanced Study of the Soviet Union, stated in a speech at the annual session of the American Association of Arms Control Supporters, SDI will merely lead to a further buildup of the arms race. Noting the USSR's serious approach to talks with the United States in the arms control sphere, he called on official Washington to be flexible and conduct a constructive dialogue aimed at eliminating the nuclear threat.

The extreme danger of transferring the arms race to space for strategic stability in the world was pointed out by J. Steinbruner, a representative of the Brookings Institution. He called for no time to be lost in taking concrete measures before it is too late to prevent the militarization of space.

If the system of already concluded treaties in the arms control sphere collapses, (Dzh. Mendelson), deputy director of the association, warned, an irreparable blow will have been dealt to U.S. security. He noted the constructiveness of the Soviet proposals aimed at limiting and reversing the arms race.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1228

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS REPORTS INTERNATIONAL REACTION TO SDI

LD110005 Moscow TASS in English 2358 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] Washington, January 10 TASS -- The United States is seeking more active participation of its allies in the realisation of the "star wars" programme. According to informed observers, during the talks between U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger and Shintaro Abe, Japanese minister of foreign affairs who had arrived here for an official visit, the Pentagon chief insisted that the Japanese Government take an official decision on joining the space militarisation plans. The press reports that Japan has already expressed appreciation of the U.S. Administration's so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI) and is now studying the question of her possible role in implementing the programme. Other matters aimed at broadening military and political cooperation between Japan and the United States were also discussed at the talks.

New York, January 10 TASS -- Robert Bowman, former director of the space program of the U.S. Air Force, president of the Institute for Space and Security Studies, has stated that the purpose of the "star wars" programme is to create offensive weapons, and not defensive ones, as the Reagan administration is trying deceitfully to convince the U.S. public. In an interview with the newspaper PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE, he emphasized that deployment of space arms by the United States would put in jeopardy the USSR's security. It is obvious that the Soviet Union will make every effort to prevent military superiority over itself. Bowman pointed out that this is why the SDI signifies a new escalation of the arms race and the creation of new types of weapons.

Bonn, January 10 TASS -- When Chancellor Helmut Kohl advertises the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) and presses for the participation of the FRG's companies in it, he refers to a certain "side benefit" of appropriate research to technological progress for the peaceful purposes, writes the influential STERN magazine. However, the chancellor deeply errs. Non-military uses of the SDI's results are a myth which has little in common with reality. The magazine reports that on an assignment of the Ministry for Scientific Research and Technology of the FRG, a study was carried out with a view to finding out whether work under the "star wars" programme can be of benefit to the development of advanced technology for civilian purposes. Prominent experts have analysed more than 600 materials, predominantly U.S. ones. A conclusion which the specialists have arrived at disproved the propaganda thesis of the "star wars" advocates: the SDI programme cannot be justified from the viewpoint of politics and the research tasks of the civilian sector.

/8209

CSO: 5200/1228

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SDI 'SPACE VERSION OF FRANKENSTEIN'

LD112116 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Vladimir Bogachev commentary]

[Text] A new round in the Soviet-American nuclear and space arms talks begins in Geneva next (?Thursday). A commentary from our observer of military affairs, Vladimir Bogachev:

This round of talks is the first one after the summit meeting, and that (?instills) hope because the leaders of the two countries reached important accords. The objective of the talks was reaffirmed and it lies in working out and concluding agreements to prevent an arms race in space and to stop it on earth. It was decided to speed up the work (?of) these talks. It is also important that there lie on the negotiating table Soviet proposals on a 50-percent reduction of nuclear weapons of the Soviet Union and the United States that can reach each other's territory. However, progress at the talks is possible only provided there is a full ban on strike space weapons or, in other words, if the "star wars" program is renounced.

Why is this so? The point is, action on this program would bring about strategic chaos, with the arms race getting out of control. As work continues in the United States on the SDI project, as the development of space arms is officially called, the danger the project presents becomes more and more obvious. Even the project leaders themselves now admit it is far from a defensive one. For example, the director of a section to organize the implementation of the SDI project, John Gardner, said that the implementation of the project would sharply tip the nuclear balance in favor of the United States. At the same time, the official didn't give any promises that the SDI could be reliable as a means of defense. A former presidential aide, George Keyworth, said the "star wars" program provided for the creation of a lid over the Soviet Union instead of a shield over America. Apparently, this means the deployment of attack space weapons over Soviet territory to hit targets on the ground. The SDI is not a means of defense, but an instrument of aggression. If American arms are sited in terrestrial space the Soviet Union will find effective means to counterbalance them and that response will be both quick and less expensive than the American program.

A highly dangerous aspect of the American "star wars" system lies in the fact that the vast number of computers used in it can take decisions, by-passing people.

These intricate computers may develop faults which will be hard to spot. Even a small fault in a nuclear activated space laser could bring about irrevocable consequences. The SDI may well prove to be the space version of Frankenstein, an invention that killed the man that made it. The summit meeting in Geneva showed that accords reached earlier between the Soviet Union and the United States about the subject and objectives of the talks is the basis for drafting mutually acceptable agreements. A radical cut in nuclear arsenals can be achieved only if the "star wars" program is renounced.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1228

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET ACADEMICIANS EXAMINE EFFECTS OF SDI, ARMS RACE

PM101550 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English 29 Dec 85 p 5

[Feature prepared by Nikolay Zaborin: "Space Age Challenge"]

[Text] A plastic cube weighing 100 grammes flies out of a device called an electromagnetic gun at a speed of over 20 kilometres per second;

The ray of a high-capacity chemical destroys the hull of a Titan ICBM;

A 6-metre-long two-stage missile, launched from a high-altitude fighter-interceptor, shoots down a satellite in orbit.

These tests have already been conducted in the USA. We may add to this the elaboration of superhigh-speed computers and their software, of special reflectors -- "rubber mirrors" -- for focussing and re-aiming a laser ray sent to orbit from the Earth, and many other "outlandish innovations". All of them are prototypes of the space weapons of the future, which advocates of the "star wars" programme (officially known as the "Strategic Defence Initiative") intend to produce in the USA.

What can the SDI bring the world? Will it make nuclear weapons obsolete, or will it give a fresh impetus to the arms race? What, in general, are the fundamental principles for guaranteeing international security in our time? A number of prominent Soviet specialists expressed their views on these problems at a press conference in Moscow.

Georgiy Arbatov, academician, director of the Institute of US and Canada Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences:

Not only different stands on the limitation of these or other types of weapons, or on regional questions, but also two different, and, I'd say, opposite concepts of security clashed at the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva.

The main components of the Soviet concept are as follows:

Security can be only mutual if we speak about the USSR and the USA; and if we have the entire international community in mind -- then it can be only universal. We cannot work for security to the detriment or against the security of this or that side, but only work together. The lack of a feeling of security by the other side leads to nervousness, to unpredictability of its action, and, therefore, offers a threat to yourself.

Security cannot be based ad infinitum on terror, or on "unacceptable retaliation," or, as it is sometimes said, on a balance of terror, deterrence or containment. This only steps up the arms race -- one has to arm oneself all the time in order to scare the other side. In such a case the arms race gets out of control far beyond the limits of everything reasonable in the field of mutual deterrence.

Granted the present level of development of the means of destruction, security cannot be guaranteed by military-technical means. This is a political matter and can be dealt with only by political means. This calls, above all, for a political will to stop the arms race, which has become the main threat in the nuclear age, and to start on the trek back -- towards disarmament. But there is also a more substantial, more long-term task -- with all the differences between the two countries, we must learn to live with one another on earth, and to live in a civilized manner, without excesses of rhetoric, by taking the interests of each other into account, and in conditions of developing mutually advantageous cooperation.

The time factor has become critical. Political activities cannot be postponed to the future, they are needed now, at once. If it were possible, they were needed even yesterday!

It is already extremely hard for us to negotiate with the USA because instability has grown and, with it, suspicions and mutual distrust. The continuation of the arms race and the emergence of new weapons systems make dialogue and, even more so, the achievement of accords even more difficult, if not impossible.

The second reason is that scientific-technological progress in military affairs is steadily reducing the time and the opportunities for adopting political decisions on problems of war and peace and transfers these questions to computers, which creates a colossal threat. Just one example: the flight time to target of Pershing-2 missiles of 7-9 minutes, coupled with the "decapitation theory," leaves absolutely no time for making any sort of decisions in an emergency situation.

The USSR and the USA have only 10 percent of the world's population. Our is a complicated, interconnected and interdependent world of many dozens of states and nations. Each one of them has its own vital, quite legitimate interests. Each country is an independent subject in international relations. And our world is in a state of constant change, because no one can guarantee an eternal "status quo."

An absolutely new situation has taken shape, which signifies the rejection of the old way of thinking of behaviour, which had been taking shape for ages, even for millennia. We realize how difficult it is to grasp these new realities and to restructure radically, in keeping with them, the entire system of international relations. But mankind's survival will not be guaranteed if this problem is not solved. We are trying to bring our political thinking into accord with these realities, without declaring that we have already completely solved this problem. And we invite all the other states to take part in this major work.

Unfortunately, in Geneva we came up against another concept, based on the attempt made to guarantee security with the aid of force, military-technical means or some sort of a "technical trick." The key element in this are the "star wars" which have nothing in common whatsoever with defence.

Essentially there exists not one SDI but a whole set of SDIs. There is President Reagan's SDI -- a dream, nearly a religious dream of an absolutely impregnable shield which would make nuclear weapons powerless. For Weinberger, the defence secretary, and many others the SDI is nothing else but an opportunity to torpedo the existing agreements, talks and the very process of arms limitations. For some generals the SDI is a limited shield, but in that case it is nothing else but a component for securing a first strike capability. Some others regard the SDI as a tool for drawing the USSR into a new ruinous round of the arms race so as to try to bleed it economically. The SDI version for the military-industrial complex is money. And true enough, the published data tells us that, granted the present state of affairs, the military allocations on nuclear weapons and means of their delivery will reach their peak in the next 4 years, whereas the SDI promises 30 years of huge, steady orders.

We fear not the threat created by the SDI, but that which should be feared in the USA, in Europe and everywhere else -- the situation of a complete strategic chaos, of an unlimited arms race. All that can bring the nuclear war nearer. This is what everyone should fear, including the Americans and their allies, who, under the pretext of Atlantic solidarity, are trying to escape responsibility for the vitally important political decisions on the destinies of peace and their own nation.

Yevgeniy Velikhov, academician, vice-president, USSR Academy of Sciences:

An important moment of the Geneva summit is that the sides, as they confirmed it in their accords, will not be seeking for the means to build up a strategic superiority. This is a recognition of the state in which both countries are now -- the state of nuclear parity. The efforts applied by the present-day U.S. Administration in the first half of its term to develop numerically and qualitatively its means of nuclear attack, failed, as we can see it today, to produce the results it desired. The parity will be maintained -- the world can no longer get out of it. However, the greatest paradox of all in these conditions is that the most powerful weapons ever devised by man cannot be used either as a means of politics or a means of warfare. The reluctance of certain circles of people to recognize this fact is the cause of many problems that arise today.

Such an element as stability is inherent in parity itself. The development of new types of nuclear weapons capable of accurately hitting small and protected targets (Pershing-2, cruise missiles, submarine-launched D-5 missiles, etc.) leads to a considerable reduction in the stability of parity, even though, on the whole, it is preserved. This is fraught with many dangers and the realization of this fact leads to two conclusions -- the need to end the qualitative improvement of nuclear arms and the need for their reduction.

Why are we taking such a principled stand on the question of space arms? Above all, because this problem goes beyond the realm of antimissile defence. Space arms, the same as nuclear arms -- are global weapons. To remind the reader, the well-known research paper of scientists on the so-called nuclear winter shows that no matter where a nuclear war may flare up, every earth person will be affected by its catastrophic consequences in one way or another. The same is happening with space arms -- no matter what weapon is orbited, it cannot be suspended or kept in one place. The weapons systems will be revolving around the globe and the entire near-earth space will have to be saturated by them so that they could be used against missiles, land-based targets, aircraft, etc.

Another danger is in that an attack weapon can be distinguished from a defence weapon only after it has been used. It is very hard to differentiate them technologically, the more so that small modifications may change the nature of the use of this or that system.

But still, what will, after all, happen if an attempt (a hopeless one, in my opinion) will be made to get outside the limits of strategic parity? The analyses made both by our and Western scientists show that the space echelons would be extremely vulnerable and, essentially, defenceless, because it is so very easy to destroy a space station, the same as any other sophisticated system. The building up of means of counteraction can be quite effective especially from the point of view of the cost. A U.S. research paper said that the cost of a hypothetical space station and an antimissile with a single warhead and a very short flight time to target differs by a factor of 10 to the power of 2 i.e. by 100 times! The task of strengthening security with the aid of the SDI is an illusion.

It is crucial that all people realize that we are today at a critical stage of human history. The weapons systems are becoming extremely sophisticated and their further development will make the process of their limitation, which was not adequately effective to begin with, effective in general.

Roald Sagdecev, academician, director of the Institute of Space Research, USSR Academy of Sciences:

When we were confronted with the practical change in the U.S. strategic doctrine, even though it was not based on detailed or serious scientific arguments, but on the vision of a single person or a group of people, or a dream, we, naturally, were forced to get together sizeable research forces to make a serious analysis of the scenarios in which the SDI begins to intermingle with the nuclear deterrent forces -- the main-stay of the strategic balance of our time.

We considered, above all, the technical components of the SDI system -- the interceptor-missiles -- land-based or installed on large space platforms, the so-called combat stations -- the types of weapons that are to utilize superpowerful laser systems, particle accelerators and the so-called electromagnetic guns. These calculations, the same as the assessments by foreign scientists, including those who worked for military science, lead us to the conclusion that the SDI is an extremely fanciful, vulnerable and costly programme, which cannot create an absolute shield.

According to the SDI creators, it will be able to repulse only 80 or a maximum of 90 percent of enemy intercontinental missiles. Whereas a mere 1 percent of the ICBMs from each side can today carry approximately up to 100 warheads, with a yield equivalent to about 5,000 Hiroshimas. This alone shows that the defence forces are incapable of changing the existing strategic balance. In real life, however, we should take into account also other components, particularly the medium-range missiles which, as a rule, have a flatter trajectory and the cruise missiles against which the SDI doesn't offer any method of defence. But if your space shield is full of holes, isn't it more enticing to deliver the first strike so that your hole-ridden shield could at least stop the weakened retaliatory blow of the other side?

Space weapons will bring one more type of instability. According to our estimates, it happens that a mere 0.1 per cent of the SDI's fire power, intended, supposedly to shoot down missiles, is enough to destroy at one go its twin -- the SDI system of the other side. After which it all begins at the beginning again.

Naturally, when faced with the possible change in the enemy's strategic doctrine, one has to choose a way which would be in accord with conditions of strategic stability with the aid of minimum economic investment. As it happens, the method based on countermeasures conforms to these conditions. Today already several dozen such countermeasures apparently exist. They presuppose the imparting to the strategic retaliatory forces additional stability, durability, maneuverability, and make them more quickly deployable, so that the hypothetical "star wars," about which some shortsighted politicians are dreaming, if it should happen (and it will last 2-3 minutes), would pose very complex problems to the side which would wish to hide behind the star shield after delivering the first strike.

When putting forward their concept, the "star wars" advocates expect to arouse the layman's imagination so as to persuade him that the nuclear genie that had been released from the bottle in 1945 in Hiroshima, can be chased back into the bottle by the efforts of scientists. But science can only study nature's fundamental laws and not violate them. Would it not be better to channel the forces of scientists, including the U.S. technical genius, which we respect very much, into another direction? Then science would be able to yield real fruit to humanity in the struggle against hunger, in dealing with the ecological and other global problems and in learning the secrets of the universe. ([Sagdeyev ends])

[Zaborin] Reason and political will are the means which can really render nuclear weapons unnecessary and powerless, guarantee international security and the conditions for further development. The press conference hosts declared that 1986, with its new talks and meetings, will be decisive in determining the road along which humanity will make progress.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1228

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

NEW SOVIET BOOK ON SPACE ACTIVITY URGES SPACE LAW

PM091537 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Jan 86 Second Edition p 3

[Review by Candidate of Juridical Sciences Colonel of Justice I. Kotlyarov:
"Danger to Mankind"]

[Text] Man's space activity is increasing yearly. It is entering the life of more and more countries and peoples. The global nature of this activity and of its consequences dictates the need for space activity to be regularized in international law and for efforts to be pooled with a view to preventing the militarization of space and stopping it from being turned into a source of deadly danger to all mankind. The militarization of space would mean a qualitatively new stage in the arms race.

However, the United States continues to insist on implementing its "star wars" program and has not abandoned its attempts to turn space into a bridgehead for war. The exposure of the aggressive U.S. plans to militarize space and of the danger they pose to civilization is the central problem in the recently published book "International Space Law" ["Mezhdunarodnoye kosmicheskoye pravo," International Relations Publishing House, Moscow, 1985, 208 pages, price 80 kopeks], prepared by an authors collective of Soviet international jurists -- I.P. Blishchenko, B.S. Vereshchetin, Yu. M. Kolosov, and A.S. Piradov.

Because of its aggressive nature, the authors emphasize, imperialism uses scientific and technical progress to create increasingly sophisticated types of weapons. And space rocket technology is no exception. This line shows up particularly in the activity of the United States, which has always viewed space as some kind of "absolute position" whose capture will enable it to rule the world.

The directive on national space policy for the next decade, which President Reagan signed 4 July 1982, lays special emphasis on space exploration for military purposes. Developing that directive, on 23 March 1983 the United States proclaimed the "star wars" program, which is extremely dangerous for the destiny of peace. The program provides for the creation [sozdaniye] and deployment of a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements, which is banned by the 1972 ABM Treaty.

The book covers the chief international legal problems concerning the use of space. At the same time the authors set forth in a quite detailed and convincing manner the Soviet program of peaceful space exploration. The essence of Soviet policy is to outlaw the militarization of space.

The book is of interest not only to students of problems of international space law but also to a wide circle of readers.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1228

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR'S GEN CHERVOV ON U.S. SPACE ARMS BUILDING

AU101146 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 9 Jan 86 pp 1, 7

[Interview with Colonel General Nikolay Chervov by APN military commentator Vasiliy Morozov: "The 'Star Wars' Plans--A Threat to the Whole World"--date and place not given--first paragraph is newspaper's introduction]

[Text] At present the United States is trying to assert the thesis that the attack-oriented space devices that are being developed are -- allegedly -- only defensive and not offensive weapons, and that the United States is not trying to create and deploy space weapons designed for attack in outerspace. This misleading thesis is commented by Colonel General Nikolay Chervov in an interview with APN military commentator Vasiliy Morozov.

[Morozov] What concrete facts could once more affirm that the attack-oriented space weapons that are being developed in the United States are, above all, offensive weapons?

[Chervov] Already for 3 years now the U.S. Government has been trying to convince everybody that the so-called SDI is only a defense that allegedly does not constitute a danger for anyone, and that the attack-oriented space devices that are being developed are not even weapons, but only "harmless devices" (C. Weinberger's statement).

The world public is aware that the space devices that are being developed are weapons, and that SDI constitute the spread of the arms race into outer space.

Regarding the statements of Washington representatives that SDI is only for defense and that the space devices allegedly are only a defensive weapon -- this is an obvious untruth. U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger says straightforwardly: "If we have in our hands a system that will be effective and render the Soviet arms systems ineffective, we will actually return to the situation that existed when we were the only country possessing nuclear weapons." It cannot be any clear. The "Strategic Defense Initiative" is a part of the overall U.S. military plan, based on an offensive nuclear strategy. That initiative will not become defensive only because it is so named. Its objective is obvious -- it is to devalue the USSR nuclear potential that acts as containment factor. If SDI were realized, the United States could carry out the first nuclear strike without having to worry about a corresponding response, because the Soviet Union's retaliatory strike -- according to the plans of the Pentagon strategists -- could be repulsed by the American antimissile defense system.

According to a BOSTON GLOBE report, at a closed conference of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, J. Gardner, director of its department for the realization of SDI admitted that its realization "will rapidly shift the nuclear equilibrium in favor of the United States." According to the "scenario" for nuclear war that he submitted, the antimissile defense system with components deployed in outer space would enable the United States -- even in a case of "bilateral nuclear exchange" -- to preserve the striking power of the strategic offensive weapons.

And now let us have a look at the situation through the eyes of the Soviet Union. It is quite obvious that for its part it would not be sensible to help to enhance the effectiveness of the American antimissile defense by restricting its strategic nuclear forces. This the USSR will never do. It cannot and will not acquiesce to such an accord to the detriment of its own security.

The attack-oriented space devices that are being developed in the United States are the latest modern weapons (they employ narrowly routed energy sources -- lasers, kinetic and electromagnetic cannons, self-targeting missiles and projectiles) with great striking power, that are capable, in a very brief span of time and in great quantity, of destroying designated targets thousands of kilometers away in outer space or on earth.

[Morozov] Why are the attack-oriented space devices an offensive weapon in the first place?

[Chervov] First; because the space devices together with the strategic offensive weapons beef up the offensive potential and provide the possibility of a scot-free first strike, because -- to a considerable extent -- they weaken the other side's retaliatory strike.

Second: the space weaponry can be successfully used for the unexpected destruction of the most important space instruments belonging to the other side, and thus deliberately blind it, unexpectedly occupy it, and thus paralyze it, or completely deny it a retaliatory strike.

Third, space weapons 4,000-5,000 km away can be regarded as practically a universal weapon. Such a weapon can be used for fulfilling offensive tasks and partly for attacks from outer space on targets on earth (for example, airfields, motor fuel depots, dams, agricultural installations, and so forth).

Fourth, the attack-oriented space devices are capable on their own of delivering a first-strike. Western experts and scientists claim that the devices can destroy missiles in concrete and steel silos, which makes them first-strike weapons, capable of rendering the opponent's missiles inoperative even before they have been launched.

In its propaganda, the American government highlights only the defensive capabilities of space weapons. That these weapons can also serve for attacks on objects in outer space and on earth -- about all this it keeps silent. It is namely to its disadvantage to talk about it. Above all, because the nuclear weapons that are now being developed are the main obstacle on the path to the limitation of the nuclear arms buildup. The positions of the United States, which insist on launching weapons into outer space, block the Geneva talks. This is a fact that must be taken into consideration.

[Morozov] As before, representatives of the American government assert that SDI, allegedly, puts an end to offensive nuclear weapons. What could be said about this?

[Chervov] Such a statement only disorients unknowledgeable people. If SDI is to put an end to offensive nuclear weapons, as Washington asserts, why, then, does the United States keep on increasing the number of its strategic devices, why does it develop the ground-launched MX and Midgetman ICBM's and the submarine-launched Trident-2 ballistic missiles, and B-1B and stealth heavy bombers, why does it deploy thousands of long-range cruise missiles launched from air, sea, and land, why does it stockpile Pershing II ballistic missiles in Europe?

All these devices are first-strike weapons. Words and deeds are not one in Washington, but are at a considerable variance.

There is one more important factor we must take into consideration: At present, Washington is secretly carrying out intensive research into a means of overcoming the other side's antimissile defense. And thus another question crops up: If SDI is to put an end to offensive nuclear weapons, why, then, create a means designed to overcome antimissile defense? It is obvious that this is not for the purpose of defense, but for a nuclear attack.

The Pentagon keeps this work strictly secret, but, as the saying goes, you cannot hide an awl in your pocket undetected.

The American press has already reported that the Pentagon has been developing rapidly-flying cruise missiles that will fly so low that the other side's radar will be unable to detect them, perfecting the warheads of its ballistic missiles and the multiple warheads for its intercontinental ballistic missiles and intermediate-range missiles, and is studying the possibility of shortening the trajectories of missiles in the launch phase in which they are most vulnerable to the space systems of antimissile defense.

The Pentagon is also carrying out other research intended to enhance the U.S. nuclear potential and enable it to carry out a first strike. At the same time, Mr Weinberger pretends that this is being done for the purpose of nuclear disarmament. Only practical deeds can affirm the significance of the things that were useful that were agreed on at the Geneva summit.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1228

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

EUROPEAN PARTICIPATION IN SDI PROBED

Unknown KAPITAAL & BUSINESS in Dutch No 15, Fall 1985 pp 27-31

[Article: "Strategic Defense: What's In It For Us?"]

[Text] When President Reagan uttered the first words about Strategic Defense in March 1983, very few people had ever thought about the idea of defense from space against a massive nuclear attack. Or better: after seeing "Star Wars" (the movie, that is), many people fantasized about space overflowing with space stations and ultrafast space tools. Once they came to their senses, however, everyone realized that nothing of this nature was in store for the present. A defense plan such as this would be feasible neither technologically nor financially.

When a budget proposal for a highly-developed program was introduced in the U.S. Congress on 1 February 1984, many people were dumbfounded. This meant that the White House was prepared to accept the political consequences of a project that over a period of 5 years would cost no less than \$26 billion! Various reports (including the "Technology Plan" of the Defensive Technology Study Team--DTS) also contended that the Strategic Defense Initiative is technologically feasible, naturally provided that political and financial willingness could be mustered.

Against the current of pacifist protest and propaganda set in motion by the East, who spread around the most peculiar visions of a so-called "star war," the U.S. Congress gave the green light last October. The aforementioned amount of money is extended over the period from 1985 to 1989, which means that already this year funding has been made available to the SDIO, the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization. The SDIO is responsible for the planning, budgeting, execution...of the entire project, although the funding is largely in the hands of the cabinet departments. Only a modest part of the budget is directly controlled by the SDIO. The SDIO functions at the same time as a promotional organization, although some see SDIO more as a potential "good customer" on the order books. Certainly not without reason.

Only the United States?

Initially, the DTS pointed out that SDI would need \$2.385 billion in its first year of operation. For budgetary reasons, the Department of Defense cut the

proposal back to \$1.777 billion, but Congress insisted on a further reduction to \$1.4 billion. Nevertheless, the Americans are at any rate prepared to strive for the set objectives in 1986.

There is a serious amount of money involved here, and as a consequence American industry is furiously raking in the orders. It is not only industry, however, but also the academic world. For many, SDI is in fact not only a military project, but also a project from which the industrial and scientific spin-off could be gigantic. No single government initiative, anywhere in the world, has ever managed to allot so much money, directly or indirectly, to scientific research (except in the Soviet Union, where the distinction between economic and scientific production and military development is not made). And, as Professor Desmond Smith of Heriot-Watt University in Edinburgh says: "You don't refuse money when it is offered to you for basic research."

At the moment, 800 research projects within the framework of SDI are already on their feet. These programs are in part assigned to divisions of the U.S. Department of Defense and other departments, as well as to specialized sections of the Army itself. On the other hand, a considerable number of the programs are being contracted out to the private sector.

Only the American private sector? No, the SDIO report that was presented to Congress this year clearly states that the United States will regularly consult its Western allies about SDI in the coming years by way of various channels, such as NATO. This consultation is to be on both a political and a technological level. In fact, the United States does not exclude the possibility that in the long run the development of SDI can be expanded to include strategic defense of Western Europe. At the same time, the United States is worried about industrial and scientific cooperation. Are they asking for money? Not initially, but what they are asking for is knowledge.

In 1983, President Reagan requested a report on American industrial and technological potential. This commission, headed by John A. Young, president of Hewlett-Packard, came up with a particularly interesting "feasibility" study. The Young Report was presented in January of this year, and according to its findings the United States has lost ground in quite a number of areas. The report stated that the United States has lost the lead in 7 of the 10 top categories of "high-tech," and that during the 1970s work productivity rose more sluggishly than in a large number of other industrialized countries. Which leads one to strongly suspect that the United States could use scientific input from the outside. Some contend that SDI is nothing more than a protectionist operation. The Man on the Moon project of the 1960s put no less than one and a half million people to work at the time, which amounted to a form of economic subsidy. Something that, in view of the philosophy in the White House, seems to us today to be impossible. Nevertheless, the parallel is striking, and this argument cannot be simply brushed aside. If this suspicion is confirmed, then it looks as if this new industrial revolution will again make the United States the world leader in various crucial sectors of science and trade.

Attention Called

What many people contend is true: Europe no longer scares the Americans by what it says or does. But one cannot expect much else, since they have not enjoyed much European public sympathy over the last 15 years. The Americans view this--perhaps justifiably so--as crude ingratitude for its large role in our security.

At first glance, West European government leaders and heads of state are not entirely happy with SDI. Once again it presents them with difficult political decisions, and definitive support for SDI is being delayed. However, the United States is not exactly stamping with impatience. After all, SDI will supposedly keep science and industry busy for another 20 or so years, and anything can happen in the meantime. Moreover, the Americans are in the meantime turning to Japan, where they can expect much greater political affability. Conclusion: if the Americans can get in Japan what they cannot find in Europe, then they will not wait until Europe is able to keep abreast. It is thus less a matter of scientific knowledge than of political readiness.

Saying that we do not stand a chance anyway in competition with Japanese and American high technology is not much help. This should provide the umpteenth example of our historical provincial mentality. We can crawl into our little corner and say that SDI is ushering in a new phase in the arms race (which is nonsense) and that the "others" are still overtaking us. At the same time we could contend that if we participated in SDI we might be tricked out of it later. However, all of this does nothing to change reality. Even without considering a number of political and military reasons, it is practically certain that Western Europe is going to have to learn to live with this reality...and is, moreover, going to have to play a role in it.

"Shopping List"

The SDI program is extremely complex. The pretty photographs and drawings in numerous publications depict only the most spectacular aspect of it: space tools. However, each of these "tools" is composed of hundreds and thousands of various parts originating from a similar variety of scientific methods of thinking and industrial production techniques. In addition, all these parts have to meet conditions imposed on them by outer space: the absence of oxygen, other gravitational forces, other relevant sources of energy, other forms of radiation.... Our knowledge about this is still relatively limited. There is a real possibility that West European companies and scientific institutions can make a contribution in the form of new know-how and new technologies. Certain companies are even ahead of the Americans and the Japanese in a number of areas. Indeed, even if they were not in the lead, this does not mean that those companies would not over the course of time succeed in becoming competitors and thus have a chance at the projects on the shopping list.

In the gamut of necessary technologies, it is possible to distinguish five priority aspects, for which there is the greatest amount of attention--and thus the greatest demand! One by one there are:

--The interception of projectiles (in this case, ICBMs) during the first two phases of the trajectory (boost phase and post-boost phase); what is involved here are lasers and particle beams, as well as chemical accelerators and electromagnetic sources of power. The vulnerability of the target, as well as the counter-measures taken to provide the target with extra protection, will determine the extent of force necessary.

--Observation of the target, including differentiation of the real target from decoys, and from matter suspended in space.

--Adequate "interceptors," intended for tracking the target during its entire flight; quite a number of these are necessary, and as a consequence an attempt must be made to achieve this at the lowest possible cost.

--The durability of the installations deployed in space, with respect to the protection of these installations against attack as well as to resistance to the natural environment in space.

--The realization of a system that guarantees an extremely high degree of readiness, and that at the same time can be examined and maintained regularly and inexpensively.

As far as these five aspects are concerned, it is assumed that control of the equipment in space will no longer present any problems by the end of this century. If one follows current trends, one knows that computer science is being elevated to a higher level every 3 to 4 years, by which this possibility appears to be in the cards. However, there are more serious problems associated in particular with the issues of readiness and especially of maintenance.

Thus, the task of the SDIO is far from simple. Consideration must be taken of not only scientific and technological knowledge, but also the present availability of systems and components, as well as companies and institutions that have already advanced further in a particular area. To that end, the SDIO is contacting governments, business federations, universities...in all friendly and interested countries, although in the end all these institutions must themselves provide the proposals. It is thus obvious that the blessing of government authorities is necessary first and foremost, because U.S. government policy is not oriented towards passing on to its partners.

The SDIO sees cooperation in the form of research programs shared by government laboratories, an exchange of scientists, the participation of foreign firms in projects assigned to American companies, or direct competition between foreign firms and American firms.

Belgium Too?

If there is already a provincial mentality in Europe, then it is often just as much the case in our own country. This is a reproach directed not towards particular persons or institutions as much as at the inferiority complex that has characterized our culture so often. It is true that through a number of political and economic miscalculations we have over the years fallen behind in

on a number of levels. But this does not mean that we have nothing to offer the world.

Take a company like CBL (Compagnie Belge de Lasers): This company can presently produce lasers with 5 kilowatt capability. Knowing that lasers will be necessary within the framework of SDI (see the first priority in technology in the list above) with a capability of 100 kilowatts or more, this appears to be very easy. Nevertheless, the present potential is of less importance than is willingness: it is sufficient to set higher objectives and to submit a proposal within the framework of one of the SDI projects; once the order has been promised, the necessary investment can presumably be drummed up without too much trouble so that very powerful lasers can be produced. This notion is not naive! One must in fact take into consideration the fact that Western technology will be influenced to an important extent by SDI: During the next 20 years quite a large number of new projects will be launched, and thus the idea is to jump on the bandwagon at the right moment, perhaps not until 5 or 10 years from now. An advance refusal to participate, however, would mean that a large number of opportunities in the near future could be lost.

The participation of West European science and industry in SDI can be viewed from various angles. It is first and foremost a fact that Belgian industry should not watch quietly from a corner. The SDIO will be issuing interim reports on a regular basis, providing information on new projects. Trade and industry must follow these closely and, if the opportunity presents itself, compete for an interesting contract.

Secondly, one should assume that programs will frequently be entrusted to American companies. The latter will thus act as head contactors for large projects, which implies that West European firms have a chance at getting subcontracts for a number of aspects of the main contract.

Thirdly, a large number of West European companies have branches or affiliate firms in the United States. This means that an American main contractor can implement the contract in cooperation with the main office or the affiliate in Europe. Something similar to this can come about if one is able to boast of one's own experience in maintaining good relations with American companies; firms, for example, that represent a European company on the American market and thus maintain contractual cooperation.

Fourthly, there is also an indirect benefit to be gained from the presence of American businesses in our country. Whenever such a company is awarded an SDI contract, the American headquarters can always--perhaps if faced with a lack of available capacity--decide to transfer a number of aspects of the contract to its foreign branches. This would not only be beneficial for employment there, but also have an interesting spin-off effect for suppliers and so on.

The most important conclusion to be drawn from this is that the most important ingredients for creating opportunity are on the one hand readiness and on the other hand a spirit of enterprise. The study published last 30 April in TECHNIVISIE can be cited in this respect. According to this study, our universities consider it feasible for us to elevate our laser technology, for example, to a higher level very quickly, through which it would be possible to

compete, even with American companies. The step that must be taken to get there is not that large, according to the report.

And there are a large number of other industries that could have a good chance for SDI participation. A company like Herbelith, for example, enjoys world reknown in the so-called "harding" of materials, as well as in the production of panels of synthetic resin for protection against atomic radiation or of ring insulators for strong current. On the other hand, a company like Barco Industries has an enormous amount of know-how in the manufacture of displays; displays are something that the SDI program badly needs all the way across the board, in view of the fact that "observing" plays a key role in all aspects of the plan (see again the list of priority technologies), in maintaining the equipment as well as in guidance, interception, differentiation...; research at Barco in this area is at a very high level.

A number of companies have a great deal to offer in radar technology, telecommunications, mirrors (an extremely important component of the SDI plan) as well.... We could go even further in enumerating the Belgian companies, or branches of foreign companies in our country, that have a serious chance--if they want it--at SDI contracts. But once again, everything will depend on the willingness and the spirit of enterprise of these companies.

Reserves

Some people contend that we clearly do not have enough experience to be able to match a high technological level such as this in terms of industry, to say nothing of science. For example, there is insufficient know-how in Belgium in the area of software calculations for radar tracking, at least for space applications. This may be true, but one must wonder whether it is then impossible to pull in foreign specialists to accomplish this.

One often-heard criticism of SDI is that before long the Americans will cause a gigantic brain drain, as a consequence of which the Europeans will in the future be left with mediocre scientists. A parallel is then drawn to the "Man on the Moon" project in the 1960s: Indeed, NASA--the U.S. space organization--is today staffed by a large number of foreign, highly qualified scientists. The counter-question is whether we as Europeans can then do nothing to get our top specialists to stay here.

The French government has provided a valuable answer to that question with the launching of its Eureka project. In a report published last June, Roland Dumas and Hubert Curien, the ministers of External Affairs and of Research and Technology, respectively, stated that technological progress can provide a guarantee for European autonomy in decision-making and independence. "Eureka" is by definition not a military project, and yet it touches on the military domain on various levels. The underlying intention of it is undoubtedly to hinder a "brain drain" to the United States (as well to Japan, where the United States has initiated talks on the SDI program). There is no doubt that "Eureka" is an interesting project, insofar as it would not imply any useless waste through overlaps with SDI. Thus, it would be of much more value if there came about talks between SDI and Eureka in order to possibly enable a division of responsibilities. Without yielding too much to the Americans in

the area of technology! Ultimately, such an approach is the only meaningful one, at least if we use the well-being of all Europeans and of the economic future as our guide.

The Eureka project also shows a few Gaullist traits. It is obvious that France wants to lead the umpteenth industrial revolution in Europe, which should give the country a few points in the political domain as well. This criticism is also raised about SDI to a certain extent. Nothing wrong in and of itself, but certainly a difficult situation.

What is the status of the issue of industrial property? If our companies get orders from main contractors, do they then keep the rights to their own technological input? Naturally there are various levels of so-called "confidentiality," but at present it is generally accepted that the rights to new discoveries go over to the main contractors. And that is somewhat intolerable to European companies--as well as to European politicians--and quite understandably so. It will be some time before an agreement is reached in that area. At any rate, the rules of the game will at least have to be determined in advance if one is to avoid unfortunate conflicts and friction.

To quote British Foreign Minister Sir Geoffrey Howe at the conclusion of the NATO meeting in Estoril at the beginning of June: "One would have been happier if there had been a full endorsement (...of the \$26 billion research project, but...) it's no secret that there were various attitudes about the longer-term applications."

What Now?

Although Eureka masterfully plays on doubts surrounding SDI, one of the big obstacles to the French project is the fact that the Europeans have to put their own money into it. And since money is not cheap these days, this is indeed a problem. However, some French observers think that SDI and Eureka are not really competing with one another, so it thus appears that they too are looking for a compromise in order not to lose the battle against the financially alluring SDI.

For Belgian companies, it is at the moment rather difficult to predict prospects for participation in SDI. American officials seem to all but forget Belgium (we are, after all, pretty small!). In addition, the Americans have thus far released no lists of main contractors. The gathering of information is thus running into practical problems.

For its part, the Belgian government has set up a commission to look into SDI and possible cooperation. This group is headed by Frans Baekelandt, Belgian ambassador to The Hague, and it brings together a number of officials and authorities from the Ministries of Science Policy, Economic Affairs and Foreign Relations. In fact, a study is being done by Science Policy on the implications of SDI scientific matters. And there is someone in the prime minister's cabinet who is exclusively concerned with the coordination of the files.

Last 30 June, the time had come: the Baekelandt Commission, together with a few scientists, went to Washington for a first prospectus. Professor Van Overstraeten from the Catholic University of Louvain was quite delighted, and pledged his support for the possibility of research. Van Overstraeten has at his disposal a very good laboratory that could be of great service to certain SDI projects. Professor Elie Milgrom, another participant in the trip, viewed it somewhat differently: he finds the ideas interesting, but feels that everything is going too fast and that a certain amount of caution should be displayed. Bell Telephone and Glaverbel went along with the Baekelandt group, but their position on the talks in the U.S. capital remains for the time being one of wait-and-see.

One peculiar thing about the entire matter is that the Flemish Economic League [VEV] is only slightly involved in the whole thing. It appears that the Belgian government views the VBO [League of Belgian Businesses] as the primary discussion partner. The VBO has in fact already set up an "SDI Commission" under the chairmanship of Etienne Davignon, former European Commissioner and at the moment director at the Generale. This commission largely corresponds to a group just set up during the summer months in the shadow of the VBO: Belgospace. Belgospace includes companies such as Fabrimetal, Bell Telephone, FN [Fabrique Nationale], SAI [expansion unknown], Cockerill-Sambre, MBLE [expansion unknown], Sabca, Belgonucleaire, Glaverbel, ACEC [Ateliers de Constructions Electriques de Charleroi], CMI [expansion unknown], Metallurgie Hoboken and Sonaca; largely firms from the G holding company.

It is also this group that received an invitation to the gathering that is to take place in October on military property in Colorado Springs, in the United States. This invitation was sent by the SDIO to West European trade and industry (not the VEV), and the gathering is intended as the first big chance for these companies and SDI to get to know one another. At the same time, projects will be specifically laid out on the table, so that it will be possible to get an initial picture of the requirements and of the possibilities. Belgospace is at any rate participating in this top gathering. In view of the fact that Belgospace cooperates directly with the ESA, the European Space Agency, one can also presume that there is somewhat more sympathy for Eureka from the VBO and the Generale; France has, after all, been the leader within the ESA (just think about the--finally successful--Ariane).

European Thinking?

Seventeen European countries, including even Switzerland, have given their conditional support to further research on Eureka. Inevitably, there must be talk of European cooperation and coordination, with respect to both Eureka and SDI. However, the fact that Eureka will in one way or another have to be built on the Esprit program, which has laid the cornerstone for European technological cooperation, does not imply that doors will be closed to SDI tomorrow. This would bear witness to a fundamentally wrong political decision and to limitless naivete.

Reference was made to an analysis of political implications in April of this year at a gathering in Bonn of the resurrected WEU, the West European Union. This attempt at a synthesis of the various opinions in force in Europe makes

it conclusively less easy; through this step, however, the opportunity was created for West European companies and governments to distance themselves from the "European position in the making," and, if they wish, to prospect for SDI projects. In other words: they got a little time.

One thing that is clear, however, is that the companies are not going to allow themselves to be dictated to by political decisions. In July, six or so companies and institutions had been assured of orders. By the end of October, perhaps by way of the gathering in Colorado Springs, this number will undoubtedly be much higher.

After the end of the first five-year plan of SDI, authorities in Washington will determine whether SDI should and can be implemented, based on the accumulated interim reports. By that time, it should also be clear whether the Europeans are definitely willing to cooperate. In other words, in 1990 both industrial and political willingness must be present. Should European confidence in Atlantic cooperation be lacking, the Americans will presumably "keep going without looking over their shoulders any more."

The dominant feeling in Flemish trade and industry is that SDI as an American concept should first of all be translated into European terms. A European concept of SDI could subsequently be expanded with an eye to both Eureka and Esprit. European unity is important in its own right.

And yet, although presently things are at times somewhat vague and there are still many "ifs" and "maybes," there is one thing that is absolutely clear: SDI is setting the scientific and industrial world in motion on an unheard-of scale, and the spin-off resulting from it is of such importance that no one, whatever their political point of view, can ignore this reality.

12271

CSO: 8018/0327

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

TASS CITES FORMER U.S. OFFICIAL--New York, 10 Jan (TASS)--The aim of the "star wars" programme is to create offensive, not defensive weapons as the Reagan administration seeks to convince the American public by deception said retired Lieutenant-Colonel Robert Bowman, director of the Washington Institute for Space and Security Studies, former senior official of the U.S. Department for the Air Force. In an interview to the newspaper PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE he emphasized that the Strategic Defence Initiative signified a fresh escalation of the arms race. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0842 GMT 10 Jan 86] /8309

USSR ACADEMICIAN CITED--Moscow, 26 Dec (TASS)--Academician Aleksandr Prokhorov, Nobel prize laureate, pointed to the need for putting up a barrier in the way of militarisation of outer space. The packing of outer space with weapons, including nuclear weapons will sharply increase the risk of a nuclear war breaking out, the scientist pointed out in an article for TASS. The Soviet Union proposes a real alternative to such plans. Yet, despite the arguments of reason and demands of public, the USA has so far failed to use the historical opportunity of joining in the USSR's unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. It is necessary to put an end to the arms race, and divert that money to combatting hunger and diseases, for the needs of development. There are no few global problems in the world, in whose resolution science could say its weighty word. But the main thing is peace. All progressive scientists should unite in the fight for the future, Aleksandr Prokhorov stresses. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1653 GMT 26 Dec 85] /8309

TASS ON WEINBERGER, ABE TALKS--Washington, 10 Jan (TASS)--Shintaro Abe, Japanese minister of foreign affairs, who had arrived here for an official visit, met with U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger on Thursday. According to informed observers, during the meeting the Pentagon chief insisted that the Japanese Government take an official decision on joining the space militarisation programme. The press reports that Japan has already expressed appreciation of the so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI) and is now studying the question of her possible role in the realisation of the "star wars" programme. Both the meeting with Weinberger and the Japanese foreign minister's visit as a whole are subordinated to the task of broadening military and political cooperation between Japan and the United States. Today Abe will meet with President Ronald Reagan and Secretary of State George Shultz. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0005 GMT 10 Jan 86] /8309

CSO: 5200/1228

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR COMMENTS ON PREPARATIONS FOR OPENING OF GENEVA TALKS

Karpov Issues Statement

PM150930 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "At the Geneva Talks"]

[Text] Geneva, 14 Jan (TASS) -- A delegation from the USSR arrived here today to conduct the fourth round of talks on nuclear and space weapons with the U.S. delegation.

In a statement made on his arrival at the airport, the leader of the Soviet delegation, Viktor Karpov, emphasized that of a particular feature of the new round of talks consists of the fact that it was preceded by the meeting between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union, which took place in Geneva 2 months ago. At this meeting, as is known, important accords were reached. A decision was made to speed up the talks. It was also confirmed that the aim of the talks is to prevent the arms race in space and to halt it on Earth; to limit and reduce nuclear weapons; and to strengthen strategic stability. The mutual understanding of the impermissibility of nuclear war and aspirations to military superiority, recorded in the joint Soviet-U.S. statement, has the greatest significance.

The Soviet and U.S. delegations face the task of translating these accords into the language of practical affairs. This concerns preventing an arms race in space, deep -- 50 percent -- reductions in corresponding nuclear arms, and an interim agreement on intermediate-range missiles in Europe.

The Soviet delegation has arrived in Geneva charged with the task of quickly progressing toward resolution of the concerns and expanding the points of contact in both sides positions. It is calculating on a constructive approach also being shown by the U.S. side. This concerns all three directions of the talks, and primarily, issues of space. As Mikhail Gorbachev stressed, if the United States finds the will and the resolve to think through afresh and to evaluate all the pernicious aspects and consequences of the "star wars" program, a path will open for the constructive solution of the problems of international security and of stopping the arms race.

The peoples of all countries await precisely such decisions after the Geneva summit meeting. Their hopes must not be disappointed.

In conclusion, V.P. Karpov expressed gratitude on behalf of the Soviet delegation to the authorities and citizens of the city and Canton of Geneva for their hospitality.

U.S. Officials' Remarks

LD151218 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1118 GMT 15 Jan 86

["Put Accords Which Have Been Reached Into Practice"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 15 Jan (TASS)--Vladimir Bogachev, TASS observer on military matters writes:

To judge from the words of Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), the current U.S. Administration sees its task as being to give itself a free hand in implementing its military programs and not to depend on international accords or talks in this area...

Speaking at a press conference in Washington in connection with the renewal of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva, the ACDA director cast doubt upon the effectiveness of the SALT II treaty and spoke in favor of continuing U.S. anti-satellite and nuclear tests and deploying U.S. strike weapons in space.

Adelman asserted that allegedly the main factor complicating the talks is "the tying in by the Russians of the question of the Strategic Defense Initiative with progress in the area of arms control." He deliberately ignored the essence of the January 1985 accord on the aims of the Geneva talks, confirmed in the joint Soviet-U.S. statement on the results of the summit meeting. Instead of seeking mutually acceptable decisions in Geneva, the agency director proposes creating a "stimulus" for talks with the Soviet Union...in the form of new U.S. weapons systems in space and on the earth.

Max Kampelman, head of the U.S. delegation at the talks between the USSR and the United States, has tried to attach greater "flexibility" to the U.S. stance. In his speech at Geneva airport he stated that the aim of the United States was the prevention of the arms race in space and halting it on earth. However, it became clear from his statement that by the prevention of the arms race in space he means deployment [razvertyvaniye] in near-earth orbit of offensive weapons, their development [razrabotak] and testing; and that by "constructive approach" to talks he means the agreement of the Soviet Union to breach the treaty on limiting antimissile defense systems and for militarizing space.

The causistic interpretation by official representatives of the U.S. Administration of the joint Soviet-U.S. statement concerning the part on the nonmilitarization of space is causing serious doubts as to the sincerity of Washington's peaceloving assurances.

The Geneva summit meeting has created the prerequisite for a move from confrontation to mutually acceptable solutions of problems on curbing the arms race. The task of implementing the accords reached in practical deeds stands before the participants of the Soviet-U.S. talks which are being resumed.

U.S. Sincerity 'In Doubt'

LD142051 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1944 GMT 14 Jan 86

[Text] Brussels, 14 Jan (TASS) -- The United States has still not abandoned attempts to achieve unilateral military advantages for itself at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons. U.S. official spokesmen continue to resort to juggled facts and figures, in order -- leading the public into confusion -- to gain support for its position in Western Europe.

The press conference given by A. Holmes, chairman of the special NATO consultative group on nuclear arms control and assistant U.S. secretary of state for politico-military affairs [as received], in the headquarters of the North Atlantic bloc, today, was a sample of such behavior.

While speaking in favor of implementing the provisions of the joint Soviet-U.S. statement, A. Holmes' statements actually put in doubt both the sincerity of the U.S. position and the U.S. effort to achieve honest agreements aimed at guaranteeing the equality and uniform security of both sides.

To justify his position, the emissary of official Washington resorted to various conjectures, in particular concerning a certain "modernization of the Soviet SS-20 missiles" being carried out in the Soviet Union. He again set forth lying reports on the number of Soviet missiles, despite the official Soviet announcement that their number in the European zone of the Soviet Union stands at 243.

A new statement by A. Holmes that the Pentagon and NATO will continue to carry out the earlier planned schedule for deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in the FRG, Britain, Italy, Belgium, and Holland, is also proof of the former unconstructive position of the United States in questions of reducing nuclear weapons.

Possibility for Success Exists

LD150025 Moscow International Service in Italian 2000 GMT 14 Jan 86

[Commentary by TASS military observer Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] The Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space weapons will resume in Geneva 16 January. A note written especially for Radio Moscow by TASS news agency military observer Vladimir Bogachev is dedicated to this topic:

This round of negotiations is special. It is preceded by a meeting between the Soviet and U.S. leaders who declared their intention of speeding up the negotiations. It is important that the tasks advanced in the joint Soviet-U.S. statement issued on 8 January 1985 should be confirmed. They are: preventing the arms race in space, ending this race on earth, limiting and reducing nuclear weapons, and consolidating strategic stability. Is it possible to attain these objectives?

We are firmly convinced that this possibility exists, said Mikhail Gorbachev in December during the Supreme Soviet session. Now, the Soviet and U.S. proposals for the reduction of nuclear arms differ in many respects, but the Soviet Union does not overdramatize this fact. Compromises are possible and we are ready to look for them, but for the solution of problems one has to close the door through which arms could get into space. Without that, a substantial reduction of nuclear weapons is impossible. This is a principled position of the Soviet Union.

What is the essence of the program presented by the Soviet Union in Geneva? Above all, it is proposed to totally ban space attack weapons. A start to the arms race in space and also the launch into orbit of antimissile systems alone cannot consolidate anyone's security. Nuclear attack devices hidden behind a space shield will become more and more dangerous and the present strategic balance will be turned into strategic chaos; channels will be open for a feverish arms race in all directions.

On the condition that a total ban is imposed on space attack devices, the Soviet Union also proposed a 50-percent reduction of all Soviet and U.S. nuclear devices capable of reaching the territory of the opponent and limiting the total number of nuclear warheads [testate] at the disposal of each of the parties to 7,000 each. These are radical reductions, counted in thousands of nuclear warheads [ogiva]. It is an equitable approach because it embraces all the devices making up the strategic balance. This approach allows one to take into account the real nuclear threat for either of the parties, regardless of the type of delivery vehicle, missile or aircraft, and of the point of launching, own territory or territory of the allies. For Moscow, the 50-percent reduction of Soviet and U.S. nuclear devices is only a beginning. The Soviet Union is prepared to go beyond that and as far as the total elimination of nuclear weapons. It is clear that other nuclear powers have to take part in this process, too.

On several occasions the Soviet Union declared it is for a complete liberation of Europe from nuclear weapons, both of medium-range and tactical ones. However, this solution has been rejected by the United States and its NATO allies. So, at Geneva the Soviet Union proposed a start from interim solutions proceeding subsequently to further reductions.

The Soviet Union is also trying to maintain military parity at the lowest possible level in Asia and the Pacific Ocean. In the Asian part of its territory the USSR only has the number of missiles required to balance the respective U.S. nuclear potential deployed in that area. On several occasions Soviet leaders stated that if the United States did not step up its nuclear presence there, the Soviet Union will also abstain from taking such steps. If the situation begins to change for the better our country will respond with adequate measures.

Right now, that is to say, before the elaboration of agreements on these problems, simple but efficient steps could be taken in the direction of nuclear disarmament. The Soviet Union proposes, in particular, an immediate freeze of nuclear arsenals and a total and unlimited ban on nuclear tests under the most efficient control possible. Last year the Soviet Union itself carried out some practical measures designed to bring down the level of confrontation. In reply, unfortunately, Washington did not take any real steps that could be interpreted as a gesture of goodwill or an indication of willingness to enter into reasonable compromises with the Soviet Union in the area of arms limitation and reduction.

We should like to recall that the Soviet Union has also decided to make nonoperational the SS-20 missiles deployed in the European part of its territory in response to the installation of U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe. In so doing, the Soviet Union accepted a considerable measure of self-limitation. Now the number of Soviet missiles capable of hitting targets in Western Europe is substantially less than that of 10 or even 20 years ago. How has the United States responded to this goodwill action? By deploying cruise missiles in Belgium and by increasing the number of Pershing-2 in the FRG. Another example: When the unilateral Soviet moratorium on anti-satellite system tests was confirmed, Washington responded by testing a new ASAT system against a real target in space. One more example: Trying to break the deadlock on a solution to the problem of nuclear tests in the summer of 1985, the USSR unilaterally introduced a moratorium on all nuclear tests. Washington replied with a series of tests checking out, among other things, a space laser fed by nuclear explosion energy.

Some advisers of the U.S. President say there should be no negotiations with Moscow because the Soviets always manage to leave the United States in a disadvantageous position. Obviously, for some circles in the United States the concept of advantage and disadvantage is not based on international security criteria, but on military supremacy aspirations. It is an illusory wish and Moscow is making this known in absolutely clear terms, but the arms race is not our choice. As before, the Soviet Union is convinced that one should work for a reduction of the level of confrontation in relations between the East and the West and for preventing a nuclear threat.

Results Depend on Approach

LD141626 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 14 Jan 86

[Observer Aleksandr Druzhinin commentary]

[Text] The Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms are resuming in Geneva on Thursday, 16 January. More from our observer Aleksandr Druzhinin:

The success of the Geneva talks will first of all depend on how realistic and constructive the approach of their participants will be to the important issues of the talks agenda.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it displayed such an approach on many occasions. It has tabled at the Geneva talks the proposal for a 50 percent cut in its own nuclear weapons and in those of the United States. Washington cannot help but admit that the Soviet proposal serves to promote the strategic stability in the world. In plain language, this means that the implementation of the Soviet proposal would help to strengthen the security of all who live on earth in the alarming conditions of today.

One of the questions to be considered at the current round of the talks in Geneva will be the question of medium-range nuclear weapons. Here too the Soviet Union has showed in practice its deep concern with the prospect of turning Europe into a nuclear stronghold. While the United States is escalating the deployment of Pershing II and cruise strike missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union has frozen unilaterally the number of its SS-20 missiles in the European zone at the level of June 1984. The additionally deployed missiles have been taken off their standby alert and the stationary structures where these missiles were deployed have been dismantled.

The acceptance of the Soviet proposal urging the USSR and the United States to give up all nuclear tests would of course be of major importance for the success of the Geneva talks and for halting the arms race. If the United States, instead of going ahead with nuclear tests, joined in the Soviet Union's initiative, it would be possible in this case to stop the modernization of nuclear arsenals and this would eventually lead to their becoming obsolete and to nuclear arms becoming unnecessary in the long run.

As you see, the Soviet Union's approach opens up broad opportunities for ensuring progress at the Geneva talks. But all the efforts aimed at ending the nuclear arms race will inevitably be reduced to nil if no solution is found to the main issue, that is the prevention of the militarization of outer space. The deployment of weapons in space would mark a qualitatively new stage in the arms race. The move may have unpredictable consequences.

The Soviet Union stands for preventing the militarization of outer space. This approach fully stems from the joint Soviet-American statement adopted on 8 January last year and reaffirmed in November by Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan at their summit in Geneva. Spelling out their objectives in it, the two sides also stressed that it is imperative to stop the buildup of nuclear arsenals on earth and limit and cut down nuclear weapons.

It is clear that if the participants in the current talks in Geneva are prepared to follow these principles, the ground will be prepared thereby for their successful work.

New Approach Hoped For

LD141753 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 14 Jan 86

[Commentary by political observer Georgiy Zubkov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The USSR delegation arrived in Geneva today for the fourth round of talks with the U.S. delegation on nuclear and space weapons. A commentary by Georgiy Zubkov, political observer:

Hello, comrades. This will be the fourth round of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva. Discussion of the problem of nuclear and space weapons began last spring.

The fourth round. The same town, the same rooms for the talks, the same familiar seats around the table. However, the forthcoming round goes beyond the framework of a routine series of discussions [ocherednoy serii diskussiy].

Yes, the topics are the same, but the approach to their solution should be a new one. In any case, precisely this new and constructive approach is expected from participants in the talks throughout the world. Indeed, the current round of talks will be held following the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. It has become a compass of hope on the difficult and complicated roads of mutual understanding, trust, and disarmament. Referring to this compass, we should move toward each other. This is the way our country is acting. Each new Soviet initiative, each new proposal, each obligation undertaken unilaterally is a consistent and confident step on the road toward peace -- tireless steps. The Soviet Union is indicating by actions that it is prepared to go as far as it takes. Is the United States prepared for this, not in words, but in deeds?

The U.S. President links the New Year with hopes of peace, but on the eve of the New Year nuclear devices capable of turning a laser ray into space weaponry were being tested underground in Nevada. And how can one combine pronouncements about the need for a reduction in nuclear arsenals with their actual increase? It emerges that there are not 108 -- as was planned by NATO -- but 156 Pershing-2 missiles in West Germany; the publication NATIONAL JOURNAL wrote about this. That is 48 additional missiles. They are, you see, considered spare parts.

The U.S. Administration is pushing ahead the "star wars" program, actively seeking its allies' participation. What is needed, however, is the absolute opposite. Not development, [razrabotka], but the banning of space strike weapons. Only under such conditions is progress possible at the talks on nuclear and space weapons, because it is not the aspiration to achieve security via new types of weapons, but the attainment of mutually acceptable accords that will lend constructiveness to the Soviet-U.S. dialogue and bring tangible results. The need for this is understood by thousands of scientists -- those who have declared a boycott of the "star wars" program -- in the United States, FRG, and Japan. Sensible politicians, such as the 30 U.S. congressmen who have come out against the nuclear explosions in Nevada, are also striving for this. People the world over want this, like the Italian peace supporters who released a flock of white doves on the island of Sicily over the U.S. nuclear missile base.

Adelman Forecasts Are 'Propaganda Ploys'

LD131420 Moscow TASS in English 1407 GMT 13 Jan 86

["Adelman's Propaganda Trickery"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, January 13 TASS -- TASS military analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes: Speaking in an interview with the Japanese newspaper YOMIURI, Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), said that "considerable progress can be expected" at Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms, which begin on January 16.

He linked his hopes for their success primarily to the "new concrete" proposals the American delegation is taking to Geneva.

The ACDA director recalled "The Soviet side's commitments to achieve progress at talks on limiting nuclear arms" but for some reason he preferred not to mention that twice last year the Soviet Union and the United States jointly proclaimed the broad common goal of preventing an arms race in outer space and terminating it on earth.

Distorting the substance of the statement of the participants in the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting last November, Adelman claimed that in Geneva the leaders of the USSR and the United States had decided to speed up the talks only on strategic arms and medium-range nuclear weapons, while leaving out the problem of keeping arms out of space.

The U.S. Administration official said in the same interview that the American side at the talks is not going to depart by a single step from its course of preparations for "star wars". That declaration by Adelman put in doubt his own upbeat forecasts about possible "considerable progress" in Geneva.

The Soviet side has stressed on more than one occasion that it would be pointless to reduce strategic nuclear arms on the comparatively limited area of the earth if the door remains open to nuclear weapons systems in boundless outer space. The security sphere, whose pivot is the problems of preventing the militarization of outer space and of reducing nuclear arms in their interrelationship, will continue to be decisive to Soviet-U.S. relations. The fact that talks continue should not be used as a justification and a cover for the arms race. Removing the nuclear threat by preventing the arms race from spilling over into outer space and bringing it to a halt on earth remains the cardinal task.

Adelman's forecasts about the possibility of progress at the Geneva talks without solving the key problem of the non-militarization of outer space are propaganda ploys intended to mislead world public opinion.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1231

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS: U.S. GROUP SAYS VERIFICATION TECHNOLOGY EXISTS

LD172146 Moscow TASS in English 1834 GMT 18 Dec 85

[Text] Washington, 17 Dec (TASS)--The American public organization Center for Defence Information has urged the U.S. administration to take a constructive stand at the talks on nuclear and outer space weapons with the Soviet Union.

The research paper issued by the centre points out that one of the gimmicks aimed at protracting these vital talks in Geneva are the claims of the administration to the effect that the Soviet Union allegedly violates the existing agreements and treaties, and that in general, before concluding agreements, it is necessary to resolve the problem of verification and control of their observance.

The authors of the research paper convincingly prove that with the present-day technological level of the national means of control, such activity as nuclear blasts, the testing and deployment of ballistic missiles, the construction, testing and deployment of such delivery vehicles of nuclear weapons as submarines and aircraft, the testing and deployment of outer space weapons are practically one hundred percent verifiable.

There is nothing new about the claims that the Soviet Union does not observe the existing agreements and treaties, and the verification problems pose difficulties, the paper says. Both the preceding and the current administration have more than once used the bugaboo of the "Soviet threat" and "Soviet superiority" to drag programs for arms build up through the congress.

There is technology for the verification of the observance of the agreements in the field of arms control, the research paper says. And only political will and a serious approach on the part of the administration to talks aimed at putting an end to the deadly weapons race are lacking.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1231

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW COMMENTS ON NEED FOR DISARMAMENT

LD140019 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 13 Dec 85

[Commentary by political observer Vladimir Tsvetov]

[Text] Unity of words and deeds is a distinctive feature of Soviet foreign policy: this is the theme of the latest news commentary. Vladimir Tsvetov, political observer, is at the microphone:

Almost a month has gone since the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva, and in the continuing comments of the world press on its outcome, the following questions are heard with increased frequency and urgency: What specifically is the United States doing, and what are they going to do for moving forward on the path of reducing strategic offensive weapons? How does the United States intend to promote the success of the talks on reducing medium-range missiles in Europe? The answers to such questions have not so far been given. And this attracts more attention, since Soviet foreign policy shows the inseparability of words and deeds.

Let there be as few as possible of general statements, solemn promises, and magnificent formulas, said Vladimir Ilich Lenin, and as many as possible of the simplest and clearest solutions and measures, which would really lead to peace, not to mention the full elimination of the danger of war.

The Soviet Union has declared that it will not be the first to deploy strike weapons in space; our country is closely adhering to its promise. Having declared the aim of achieving the banning and elimination of nuclear weapons, the USSR introduced a moratorium on all nuclear explosions until 1 January 1986. If the United States will join the moratorium, it can be extended. The Soviet Union has emphasized that it is ready to do everything necessary in order to achieve the earliest mutual limitation of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe and has withdrawn from alert duty the SS-20 missiles additionally deployed in the European zone earlier, and has dismantled the stationary equipment for these missiles.

At the Geneva talks, the Soviet and American leaders agreed to speed up the fulfillment of their understanding achieved in January of this year, to prevent an arms race in space and to end it on earth. The Soviet Union has been steadfastly following its pledge. It is the custom to say that a good deed, if it is really good, is worth more than a million good words. Concrete actions in the sphere of disarmament are the best things which can be undertaken in our time. And these deeds really are valued incredibly highly, since thanks to them peace on earth is being preserved.

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW TO NORTH AMERICA CONTRASTS U.S., SOVIET ARMS POLICIES

LD271617 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 27 Dec 85

[Commentary by station observer Vladislav Kozyakov]

[Text] The major question today is how to (?convert) the spirit of Geneva into practical deeds. The summit was a new beginning. The two powers have agreed that there can be no winners in a nuclear war and that they will not seek military superiority. Both sides reaffirmed that the task of Soviet-American arms control talks is to prevent the arms race in outer space and to halt it on earth.

Now what should be done to realize this? The Soviet Union has invited the United States to join various Soviet initiatives. Of particular significance is the proposal to ban strike space weapons and to cut by 50 percent nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territories. Unfortunately, the United States is still not prepared to outlaw the militarization of space. The SDI, or star wars, project makes the prospects of arms control agreements vast bleak, to put it mildly. Now there is a unique chance to promote nuclear disarmament, that is to introduce a joint Soviet-American moratorium on all nuclear explosions. If there are no tests nuclear weapons will be doomed to die off. To achieve this, the United States could join the unilateral Soviet moratorium on all nuclear blasts, which is in effect since last August and which expires 1 January.

Unfortunately, up till now Washington has not joined the Soviet example while many actions and statements of the administration reflect the position of the influential forces which advocate the policy of military confrontation and the unlimited arms race.

The situation in the Soviet Union in this respect is different. There are no such groups of forces or politicians in the USSR who are interested in the arms race or military confrontation. These days the Soviet people are discussing the draft of the updated version of the program of the Communist Party to be approved at the party's congress next February. The document contains major Soviet policy guidelines. They emphasize normal and stable relations with the United States, the prevention of the arms race in space and nuclear disarmament, and the prevention of nuclear catastrophe. The entire Soviet nation backs wholeheartedly the party's document.

As was agreed upon in Geneva, in the coming new year another Soviet-American summit will take place in the United States. For it to be a success constructive actions by both sides are needed now, without any delay. The new beginning in Geneva should be sealed with concrete deeds in favor of universal peace.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1231

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW QUESTIONS U.S. SINCERITY IN ARMS TALKS

LD302304 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 30 Dec 85

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Nikolay Agayants]

[Text] Two worlds--two policies. However banal this expression may seem at first glance, it absolutely accurately describes modern international relations. On the one hand, the consistent peace-loving course of the USSR and of the other states of the socialist community, a course aiming at lessening tension, at the relaxation of tension, and at curbing the dizzying arms race on earth and preventing it in space, and at cooperation. On the other hand, we have the aggressive, adventurists, and militarist course of the United States and its allies in various kinds of military blocs.

The world public, welcoming the peaceful initiatives of the Soviet Union, is following Washington's policy with anxiety and concern. This policy seeks at all costs to attain military superiority, increase allocations for weapons, and implement the most sinister star wars program. The reports that against the will of the peoples, and in contradiction to all reason, the Pentagon has continued a series of nuclear tests at the Nevada testing ground, aroused a genuine outburst of indignation among people of good will, wherever they may live. This experiment, part of the SDI and code-named Goldstone, with a force of about 150 kilotonnes, was carried out at the moment when mankind was impatiently awaiting concrete measures on the part of the American Administration in response to the Soviet proposal for a moratorium on all and every test of nuclear weapons. This action bears witness to the fact that in spite of Washington's eloquent assurances about some sort of aspiration on its part toward reducing the nuclear threat, the United States is stubbornly grasping onto its plans for a further increase of weapons on earth and transferring this race into outer space.

At the same time, as the published TASS statement states, the White House is continuing its campaign of disinformation to the public in an attempt to offload the responsibility for the dangerous tension which has arisen in the world onto the Soviet Union. This slanderous undertaking does not stand up to criticism. No, it is not the United States but the USSR which has all grounds for asking: Can one trust in what the American side is negotiating for and is it fulfilling its obligations?

/8309

CSO: 5200/1231

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW: 'PROMISING,' 'CONTRADICTION' START TO NEW YEAR

LD052257 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 5 Jan 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] Hello comrades. We are meeting at the beginning of 1986 and it has to be said that the beginning of the year has a promising and, at the same time, contradictory character. Promising, if only by virtue of the New Year congratulations from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the people of the United States of America, and correspondingly, the congratulations from Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America, to the Soviet people. This was a kind of continuation of the Geneva dialogue between the two leaders.

But this is not the only point. Actually, the exchange of New Year messages was a kind of formulation of the main point on the agenda of world politics for the entire year of 1986. It is an enormous task: to elevate ourselves above quarrels, to devote all efforts to the search for mutual understanding and trust, and to search for paths leading to disarmament.

It is here that one has to return to the fact that the beginning of the year does, nevertheless, at times appear contradictory. It is, of course, a good thing, when not only in Moscow, but also in Washington, they are declaring that nuclear war must not occur, that there can be no winners in nuclear war. Of course, trust and mutual understanding require sensible talk. But, to an even larger degree they require sensible deeds, sensible actions. Political detente -- its elements are of course alive, they are present in international relations today, in the fabric of these international relations -- it will remain unsteady if there is no military detente. Moreover, political detente itself will be extinguished if we do not manage to find solutions to the problems of reducing the arms race on earth and not allowing the transfer of the arms race into space. This political equation represents a key issue for the year 1986, this equation of survival which has to be taken up by the Soviet Union, the United States, and not only by our countries.

In the opinion of the Soviet Union, no matter how difficult this equation is, it can be solved. So in January the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons are to be resumed. I would like to recall certain steps undertaken by our side in order to find a sensible compromise at the Geneva talks.

First of all, about space. Inasmuch as space is concerned, the Soviet Union unequivocally comes out in favor of space being peaceful and only peaceful. As far as strategic weapons are concerned, the Soviet Union is proposing a 50-percent cut in strategic weapons by both sides. This is only a beginning. Other steps may follow this. As far as medium-range nuclear weapons are concerned, the Soviet Union -- which continues to come out in favor of the full liberation of Europe from all kinds of nuclear weapons -- considers it possible to come to an intermediate solution which is exactly balanced with the corresponding armaments of the countries of the West or, to be more precise, with those of the NATO countries.

Of course, it is evidently necessary to also speak about our position on nuclear tests. Recently, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev confirmed that the Soviet Union comes out in favor of freezing all kinds of nuclear weapons and a comprehensive and indefinite halt to testing them under strict international monitoring. At the same time, the Soviet Union is ready, in the very near future, to enter into talks with representatives of Great Britain and the United States in order to find a mutually acceptable solution of this truly vitally important problem.

And what about the United States? The United States talks a lot about its readiness to seek solutions to the issues on strategic and medium-range weapons, but as for SDI, the Strategic Defense Initiative, the plans to transfer the arms race into space, they generally consider it impossible to speak about this in terms of the creation of a kind of armament. They believe that SDI -- the "star wars" plans -- generally do not come within the category of armaments. But if we exclude this element -- that of not allowing the transfer of the arms race into space -- if we exclude this from the equation of survival, then the whole equation becomes insoluble. This is, of course, a very serious problem for the New Year.

If one also looks closely at the series of U.S. actions on the eve of 1986, then this, too, is quite indicative. As you remember, on 28 December the United States carried out a regular test of a nuclear charge; a test connected with work within the SDI framework. At the close of the year they completed the siting of 108 Pershing 2 missiles on the territory of a number of West European states -- strictly speaking, on the territory of West Germany. They also established 32 cruise missile batteries in Western Europe. It is significant that, with the sanction of the White House, a report was published last December in the United States about imaginary violations of the ABM and SALT II treaties by the Soviet Union. The United States always starts talking about violations of treaties of one kind or another by the Soviet Union when they themselves want to sin, when they want to avoid their obligations.

Through its deeds the Soviet Union affirms a new approach to international affairs, an approach which takes into account not only the interests of its own security, but also the security interests of its partners and the security interests of the world community as a whole.

As far as the United States is concerned, at the level of its actions, at the level of its deeds, the United States is not demonstrating such an approach. I would like to recall certain simple truth: Foreign policy is formed in many ways under the influence of domestic policy, it reflects the internal interests of whichever state. Though, of course, in its own turn, international politics creates problems for these countries. These simple and important truths are in their own way reflected in contemporary international life and in the present U.S. reality.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1231

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW: U.S., USSR TOGETHER CAN REALIZE HOPE FOR BETTER FUTURE

LD031037 Moscow in English to North America 0000 GMT 3 Jan 86

[Vladyslav Kozyakov commentary]

[Text] The Geneva summit ushered in a new beginning, a really important dialogue began for the sake of peace and security. Now we can say that the dialogue is continuing, such is the will of both Soviet and American peoples. As Mikhail Gorbachev said, they want the constructive Soviet-American dialogue to continue uninterrupted and to yield tangible results.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan have once again confirmed their mutual willingness to work in the spirit of Geneva. The Soviet Union, on its part, undertakes concrete steps to achieve understanding. It is our firm belief that practical measures are needed to implement what was agreed upon in Geneva. That's why, last year, the Soviet Union called on the United States to join a Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions. That's why the Soviet Union keeps inviting the United States to follow the Soviet example and stop conducting antisatellite weapons tests. As is known, the Geneva summit reaffirmed that the object of Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons is to prevent an arms race in space and halt it on earth. In full conformity with this understanding the Soviet Union has proposed to completely ban strike space weapons and to reduce by 50 percent Soviet and American nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territory.

Addressing the Americans over television, Mikhail Gorbachev noted: It is a reality of today's world that it is senseless to seek greater security for oneself through new types of weapons. At present every new step in the arms race increases the danger and the risk for both sides and for all humanity. It is the forceful and compelling demand of life itself that we should follow the path of cutting back nuclear arsenals and keeping outer space peaceful, stressed Mikhail Gorbachev. This is what we are negotiating in Geneva and we would very much like these talks to be successful this year.

And today, in his answer to a letter from Ken Livingstone, the leader of the Greater London Council, Mikhail Gorbachev underlined that the Soviet Union will do its utmost to close the door for space weapons, to achieve a radical reduction in nuclear armaments and, in the final count, their complete liquidation. Mikhail Gorbachev noted that the prospects of turning a Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions into a mutual understanding depend on

the U.S. Administration. Mikhail Gorbachev also said the Soviet Union is ready to start negotiations with the United States and Great Britain to find a mutually acceptable solution of such problems as an immediate nuclear weapons freeze and full nuclear weapons test ban under most effective controls. This is fresh evidence of efforts aimed at continuing the dialogue started at the Geneva summit.

Acting together, Moscow and Washington can turn the people's hope for a better future into reality.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1231

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW PAPER ON SAFEGUARDING GENEVA SUMMIT GAINS

PM101207 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 7 Dec 85 p 3

[Article by Political Observer Nikolay Pastukhov under the rubric "Views of Events": "Not Losing the Opportunity of Geneva"]

[Excerpts] Our 20th century has been complex, contradictory, and at the same time just. World Wars I and II were black days on the century's calendar. The October Revolution, the defeat of fascism, the collapse of the colonial system, the great scientific discoveries, the exploration of space, and the masterpieces of literature and art were all red-letter days in the life of mankind.

But then the hotheads on the Potomac River and the U.S. militarist monopolies once again started to dream of world domination with the help of nuclear weapons and "Star Wars." Mankind was threatened with general destruction.

The Soviet Union and the socialist community countries took on themselves the initiatives to seek a way out of the prevailing situation. They were supported by all peace-loving forces of the planet irrespective of class affiliation and political and religious convictions. The powerful peace offensive led finally to the long-desired goal--the Geneva meeting between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States. The dates 19, 20, and 21 November have begun to shine with a red light on the century's calendar.

But that was just 3 days! And what about the rest? The world fervently greets the Geneva accord that nuclear war must not be unleashed, that the sides will not seek military superiority, and that Geneva confirmed the task of averting an arms race in space. "...At the abrupt turning points of history," Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in Geneva, "it happens that moments of truth are needed just like air. The international situation has become too dangerous because of the intensified arms race, and too many frightening stores are being spun on this score. A real need has emerged to disperse this fog and to verify words with deeds."

But, some people do not want a moment of truth and continue to generate this fog by pushing on with preparations for the sinister "Star Wars." We all know very well who these "some people" are--the U.S. military-industrial complex and certain political figures in Washington who are in its lucrative

pay. For it is this public which is calling for a victorious nuclear war and for a first strike against the Soviet Union and demanding that nuclear tests be continued and that the United States follow the path of the "Star Wars" program.

So what are these forces doing 2 and 1/2 weeks after Geneva?

Recently the military-industrial complex' henchman, General J. Abrahamson, leader of the "Star Wars" program, demanded the accelerated creation [sozdaniye] of space weapons based on nuclear explosions and the continuation of the work on space-based lasers and electromagnetic guns. Commenting on J. Abrahamson's report, THE BOSTON GLOBE writes that while the American President has been asserting the "nonnuclear nature of the 'Star Wars' program," an experimental model of the X-ray laser code-named "Excalibur" has already undergone four tests at the nuclear test site in Nevada.

All these facts are well known to the American people and are rousing them to struggle for the implementation of the Geneva accords. Very prominent representatives of the country's legislative organs and ruling circles are now joining this struggle. Suffice it to mention among their number five former secretaries of state, a former U.S. defense secretary, and also presidential candidates from the last elections.

In this connection I would like to cite a remark by P. Warnke, eminent specialist in the arms control sphere and former leader of the U.S. delegation at the SALT talks. The implementation of the "Star Wars" program, he said in San Francisco a week after the Geneva meeting, will make it impossible in principle to reduce the U.S. and USSR nuclear arsenals and will lead to the further aggravation of the international situation. Over the last decades, P. Warnke recalled, a system of security has taken shape on the basis of the principle of nuclear deterrence and strategic parity between the USSR and the United States. The implementation of the "Star Wars" program will entail the breakdown of this system and an immediate increase in the level of military confrontation between the two powers. P. Warnke recalled that some time ago an authoritative commission of U.S. military experts headed by General B. Scowcroft drew a simple conclusion in a report to the U.S. President--there is now no danger to the United States of a surprise nuclear attack: First, the USSR is not planning to inflict a first strike; second, both sides proceed on the basis that they each have a sufficient stockpile of nuclear means to inflict a counterstrike which would entail irreparable damage. P. Warnke went on to say that neither the United States nor the USSR can now resolve unilaterally questions concerning the building of national defensive systems. The USSR will never agree to our proposals based on the unilateral principle of "first trust us." Trust in politics and the reduction of nuclear arsenals can only be built on a reciprocal basis. The results of the Geneva meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan, P. Warnke stressed, open up favorable prospects for the achievement of real progress in the arms control sphere on the basis of the proposals for a 50-percent reduction in strategic means. If this goal is achieved, the world will really become a safer place. It is either peaceful coexistence, P. Warnke observed, or no existence at all.

The peoples of all our planet's countries hope that reason will increasingly gain the upper hand in America. New meetings between the USSR and U.S. leaders lie ahead. In order not to complicate the achievement of future accords, it is necessary to refrain from anything which might undermine what was achieved in Geneva.

"...For its part," M.S. Gorbachev said at the USSR Supreme Soviet session, "The Soviet Union intends not to slacken the pace but--with all determination and in a spirit of honest cooperation with the United States--to seek to curtail the arms race and improve the international atmosphere generally. We expect the United States to display such an approach too."

The Geneva meeting enabled the peoples to recognize more profoundly their responsibility for the fate of peace and the need to act more vigorously. Reports from the most diverse countries, including the United States, attest that people of good will are seeking practical actions from responsible statesmen too.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1231

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

ITALIANS' VIEWPOINT ON SDI, GENEVA DETAILED BY PRAVDA

PM081727 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[Own Correspondent G. Zafesov article: "A Crucial Stage: Italy, After the Geneva Meeting"]

[Text] Rome, Jan -- Time, passing rapidly, has not only not diminished Italy's tremendous interest in the meeting between the Soviet and U.S. leaders in Geneva but, on the contrary, has provided an opportunity, after the initial assessments, to understand the event's significance in greater depth, to examine the full variety of its aspects more attentively, and to link it with Italy's own prospects and future. In several years' work in the country, I cannot recall an occasion when any theme has remained so long in the press, on the television screens, and in Italians' conversations.

In Italy, as everywhere else, the Soviet-U.S. summit was awaited with impatience and hope, the talks were followed with unremitting attention, and on completion the results were assessed with a rare unanimity. For example, Italian President F. Cossiga stated to Rome journalists that the USSR-U.S. talks "inspire great hope."

Prime Minister B. Craxi noted that the meeting's results meet the aspirations and hopes of the world's peoples and the decision to accelerate the Soviet-U.S. nuclear and space arms talks being held in Geneva will undoubtedly help to improve overall relations between countries with different socioeconomic systems and strengthen stability in the world.

The conclusion may be drawn from B. Craxi's interview in the newspaper IL MESSAGGERO that Italy would like to be more actively involved in resolving the main problems affecting the entire world's interests. In the Prime Minister's opinion, the Western European countries, which on the one hand support close contacts with the United States, have at the same time urged Washington to show moderation in its relations with the East. A similar theme was heard in a speech by F. Piccoli, chairman of the Christian Democratic Party, who said: "We are satisfied that the two sides are holding talks, but that is not enough. It would be a mistake to believe that our fate depends solely on these mighty interlocutors."

The Western European countries have differences of approach to the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI). Italy is committed to the concept expressed by Foreign Minister G. Andreotti that "it is too early to give an opinion on SDI's political and strategic significance...."

It is noticeable that in Italy there is no single approach to "star wars" either. Some leaders of the major concerns have yielded to the temptation of trying to profit from involvement in SDI. However, they are also aware here that in the implementation of the "star wars" program Washington's last thoughts are about exchanging "advanced technology" with other countries. Above all the Pentagon needs the intellectual potential of foreign scientists and engineers, including Italians. This, among other things, was what Elisec Milani, an independent left senator, said in conversation with your PRAVDA correspondent.

It is perfectly obvious that the idea of the space arms race arouses caution among Italian politicians and scientists and clear alarm among the broad strata of the country's population. Guided by common sense, they compare the fact that the USSR is ready to reduce its nuclear arsenals with the fact that the United States is preparing to deploy weapons in space.

The Italian physicist and Nobel prizewinner Carlo Rubbia was sharply negative in his assessment of the SDI plans. "I regard as absurd the very idea that to achieve technological progress it is necessary to develop [razrabatyvat] new methods of annihilating people. And science cannot be a secondary product, becoming a by-product as it were of military programs." The scientist believes the SDI program to be dubious scientifically and devastating economically. "People must be made aware," the scientist says, "that this money is being thrown away. Even if SDI is implemented from the scientific viewpoint, we should not forget the ancient story of the shield and the sword. The strengthening and improvement of the shield immediately leads to the hardening and better tempering of the sword. This path leads to deadlock. Is it not better to talk about peace and the development of science, real science?"

Since the Geneva meeting the majority of Italians seem to have taken a new look at many things, including their country's fate and situation, within the framework of the entire complex of international relations. They are inspired with hope by the foreign policy course of the USSR, which is ready to begin at least with interim solutions. They welcome with satisfaction the Soviet proposal to completely free Europe of nuclear weapons. At the same time the stance taken by the United States and NATO, whose aggressive circles remains spellbound by their old concepts, causes concern to Italians.

Ordinary Italians are also worried by the fact that U.S. cruise missiles capable of threatening the USSR and other socialist and Mediterranean countries have been deployed on their territory. They are also alarmed by the permanent presence in the Mediterranean of the U.S. 6th Fleet, which has been taking part in provocation against Lebanon, Libya, and other Arab states.

"Yes, the Geneva meeting undoubtedly made the world more stable," Michele Festa, a Rome bank official, said. "We regard the future with greater hope but cannot forget that there are foreign nuclear missiles on our soil. Aircraft from U.S. aircraft carriers fly wherever they like in our skies. In the hijacking of our passenger ship the 'Achille Lauro,' the U.S. side behaved as though the incident had happened in Texas. Like many of my fellow-countrymen I was offended by such impudence. We Italians want to transform the Mediterranean into a sea of peace but for that the Near East problem must be resolved by political means. Neither strongarm pressure nor separate deals are suitable for that."

Italian communists are sharply critical of the U.S. Administration's aggressive course. On the Geneva meeting, A. Natta, secretary general of the Italian Communist Party, stated: "Its outcome is positive. It is important that it produced a resumption of dialogue and that the decision was taken to hold a new meeting." In particular he noted the need to continue resolutely struggling with renewed strength, above all against the plans for the creation [sozdaniye] of space arms.

In conversation with us, Senator Olivio Mancini said: "The Soviet Union has demonstrated good will, realism, and dynamism in all its disarmament proposals. Their significance must not be underestimated. And Western Europe cannot underestimate them. In Italy, of course, there are certain representatives of the business world who would not be averse to profiting from the U.S. 'star wars' plans. But that is an incidental matter. Our country's real and universal interest is directed toward strengthening peace, saving civilization, and developing economic cooperation in all spheres. I do not agree that Italy's future is linked solely with the West. I am convinced that it is also linked with the East and political, economic, and scientific ties with the socialist countries."

The senator spoke about historical experience, which showed that rivalry in the arms race on earth has not produced anything positive. Why expand its sphere and transfer it to space? "I can see a more realistic path," he said, "a path of gradual, steady, and verifiable disarmament. In terms of their significance the problems discussed in Geneva go far beyond the framework of Soviet-U.S. relations alone. Incidentally, the Soviet leader more than once positively stressed Europe's independent role. For the West European countries it is now time to utilize the Geneva climate to more actively establish our continent's interest in peace and cooperation. It is the West European government's turn to speak."

The country's business circles also assess the results of Geneva positively. In conversation with us, Luigi Remigio, president of the firm "Interexpo," said: "Of course, it was not to be expected that the meetings would instantly produce the kind of understanding which would immediately change the situation which has arisen. However, the meeting between the two states' leaders lived up to our quite reasonable optimism and confirmed the real potential of dialogue. It marked the beginning of the search for new ways to resolve the most acute present-day problems. Politics and business relations are interconnected: the more in step they are with each other, the more favorably the situation in the world develops."

As for working class Italy, its attitude was expressed in brief and moving terms by Serio Costarelli, a railroad worker: "Our hopes have been revived. Now more than before I believe that future generations will not see the terrible face of war. But for that it is necessary to begin working seriously for peace this year, Peace Year, and that applies to all peace-loving states and all people of goodwill who oppose the arms race and support a space without weapons and the banning of nuclear tests."

/8309

CSO: 5200/1231

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S ZAMYATIN COMPARES U.S., SOVIET ATTITUDES IN KUWAITI PAPER

GF091812 Kuwait AL-QABAS in Arabic 8 Jan 86 p 11

[Interview with Leonid Zamyatin, head of the International Relations Department of the CPSU Central Committee, by AL-QABAS correspondent Muhammad Jasim al-Saqr-- date and place not given]

[Excerpt] [Muhammad Jasim al-Saqr] How do you appraise current Soviet-U.S. relations?

[Leonid Zamyatin] Soviet-U.S. relations, as well as the international situation as a whole, have entered an extremely important stage. The meeting between CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan in November in Geneva -- the first Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in 6 years -- provided an opportunity for a drift from the situation of dangerous confrontation which dominated in relations between the two countries, to a situation dedicated to the normalization of relations and the entire international situation. The Geneva meeting resulted the groundwork being laid for the discussion of accumulated acute problems between the Soviet Union and the United States which bode an explosion and the opportunity for reaching a better understanding on the positions of the two sides. This meeting also illustrated the main obstacle that impedes organizing U.S.-Soviet relations in times of peace and the issue of mutual security and what should be done to eliminate these obstacles. It is no longer possible to evade discussion on finding a solution to the issue of eliminating nuclear war, curbing the arms race, and eliminating the arms race in space -- as this is the most pressing issue at present -- in addition to the crucial issue of Soviet-U.S. relations.

The Geneva meeting failed to reach practical solutions to this vital issue. The U.S. leadership did not express its readiness to abandon "the star wars" program, the implementation of which may put the arms race out of control. This, in turn, will not permit reaching a tangible solution to a major issue in space and nuclear weapons. The arms race is continuing and this is causing profound concern. There are other principled issues, some international in nature and some concerning regional developments, over which the Soviet Union and the United States differ.

Despite this, there is today a new and important factor in U.S.-Soviet relations. This pertains to the continuation of meetings between the Soviet and U.S. leaders, reactivation of dialogue on other levels, and reactivation of contacts which deal with bilateral relations in addition to providing momentum to the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons with the aim of avoiding an arms race in space and on earth as well as

curtailing nuclear weapons, reducing them, and entrenching strategic stability. The two sides agreed to provide a new momentum to the efforts directed in other directions in order to curtail weapons. Of great importance is the fact that a joint understanding was hammered out which stated nuclear war should not erupt and war between the Soviet Union and the United States should be avoided, whether this be nuclear or conventional. Each side also agreed not to try to achieve military superiority. All this paved the way for the emergence of new possibilities -- after the Geneva summit -- for going ahead with the plan to curb the arms race, to normalize U.S.-Soviet relations, and to alleviate the intensity of international tension.

The crux of U.S.-Soviet relations must be considered in the process of implementing these agreements. This is in the vital interests of the Soviet and U.S. peoples. This entails adhering to the agreements hammered out in Geneva in letter and spirit. This also requires translation of words, intentions, and political statements into resolutions and tangible acts that can help normalize U.S.-Soviet relations and ameliorate the situation in general. The Soviet Union is ready to do all that it can in this direction. We proposed to the United States that the two sides radically reduce their arsenals of strategic nuclear weapons that are capable of reaching the territories of the other side by 50 percent provided a total ban be imposed on space weapons. We are ready to proceed in this direction to the point of totally eliminating nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union calls for freezing nuclear armaments without delay and for a total and indefinite ban on nuclear weapons experiments under the most effective forms of surveillance.

The Soviet Union expects Washington to adopt the same responsible position with regard to the implementation of the Geneva agreements and to the hopes which the whole world pins on these agreements. It is necessary to refrain from doing any thing that will place obstacles on the road to disarmament. It is necessary to strictly and fairly respect the agreements in force in the field of restricting armament, foremost of which is the 1972 treaty signed by the United States and the Soviet Union which pertains to the curtailment of antimissile defense systems and to keeping space free from weapons. This has a decisive importance with regard to attaining a radical reduction in nuclear weapons. It is said in the Soviet Union that the U.S. side did not make a decisive decision on the issue of demilitarization of space.

[Al-Saqr] How does the Soviet leadership evaluate the stand of the White House toward Soviet-U.S. relations?

[Zamyatin] I have already said that during the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan in Geneva, the stage for the normalization of Soviet-U.S. relations was inaugurated. But all evidence proves that U.S. hostile circles are working to obstruct the embodiment of the Geneva agreements or at least, to belittle the importance of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. It is regrettable that official circles of the higher echelon of the U.S. authorities are taking part in this regard.

We in the Soviet Union always judge the stance of the U.S. Administration toward our country according to the real policy adopted by Washington rather than what it says.

Accordingly, I can say that the U.S. Administration's stand toward a halt in nuclear testing will be an important indication.

It is known that the Soviet Union announced it would unilaterally halt nuclear testing from 6 August 1985. The international community welcomed the Soviet initiative which could have led to nuclear nonproliferation and the elimination of the danger of nuclear weapons had the United States acted likewise. The U.S. side should adopt a constructive stance on this issue and strongly respond to it as a gesture of practical embodiment of the positive results of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva.

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

BRIEFS

SOVIET ARMS PROPOSAL--Beijing, 18 Jan (XINHUA)--A Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman told reporters at a news briefing here today that the Soviet Union's latest disarmament proposal "has some new contents." He said that the proposal, put forward by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, on the eve of the fourth round of the Soviet-U.S. disarmament talks in Geneva, "has some new contents, but we still need to study it further. At present, the Soviet and U.S. positions on some important issues of disarmament are still far apart. We hope that the Soviet Union and the United States will negotiate in earnest so that progress can be made". He continued: "With regard to Asia's security, we believe that the key lies in the superpowers abandoning their rivalry for hegemony in this region, reducing their missiles and nuclear weapons, and eliminating the hotspots of Kampuchea and Afghanistan." [Text] [Beijing XINHUA in English 0824 GMT 18 Jan 86 OW] /9738

TASS REPORTS PLENARY MEETING--Geneva, 16 Jan (TASS)--A scheduled round of Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons has opened here today with the plenary meeting of the delegations. The Soviet delegation is led by Viktor Karpov, the U.S. delegation--by Max Kampelman. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1052 GMT 16 Jan 86] /8309

CSO: 5200/1231

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S BOVIN VIEWS STRUGGLE WITHIN U.S. ON FOREIGN POLICY

LD312038 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1455 GMT 31 Dec 85

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Aleksandr Bovin]

[Text] Comrades, many people favor cooperation but many are opposed to it. Geneva has indeed intensified and strengthened the political struggle within the United States on foreign policy. This struggle also embraces the upper echelons of authority.

For example here is what Henry Kissinger, whom you all know, writes: The most serious problem is to overcome what is almost a real civil war among functionaries of the U.S. apparatus alongside a no less heated public debate. The new phase in relations between East and West, continues Kissinger, must begin with the settlement of these internal conflicts. Otherwise the favorable opportunity which currently exists will be lost and that will allow the Russians to take advantage of this conflict to the detriment of the United States. Well, Kissinger's conclusion is not entirely accurate. The point is not that the Russians will take advantage of disagreements in Washington; the point is that because of these same disagreements the Americans will lose the advantage which they could gain from improved relations with the USSR. At the center of the quarrels in Washington is indeed the problem of SDI. The Pentagon as well as the military industrial complex are trying to harden the White House's position and the President himself is evidently as yet incapable of distinguishing his cosmic mirages [as heard] from earthly realities. There are a considerable number of political analysts who believe that while the current President is in power agreement on disarmament is improbable.

But there are other aspects to this. As you know our unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions expires tomorrow. We are prepared to continue not carrying out tests if the Americans follow our example. We have agreed to the mutual verification [kontrol] which Washington made such a fuss about for such a long time. But again we hear no. Or to be more precise this is even what they say to us: in principle we are not opposed but we must wait, we must think again, we must talk again and so on. And incidentally it was with regard to this that the U.S. journal NEWSWEEK recalled the prayer which is attributed to Saint Augustine in his youth. This was his prayer: Lord make me pious, deliver me from sin ... but not yet. And so the United States is saying no because that is what the star wars program requires.

Let me quote from the paper NEWSDAY: The fact that the United States will most probably reject the Soviet proposal on banning underground nuclear tests is explained by the President's decision to continue the series of underground tests designed to develop a space laser gun activated by nuclear explosions. This is indeed confirmed by the new explosion which the Americans carried out on Saturday, as you know.

They have also, as we know, rejected our proposal on stopping antisatellite weapons tests. In truth the Pentagon has met complications here. Recently the conference Committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives decided on the complete cancellation of the program for testing antisatellite systems if the President cannot prove to Congress and confirm that the USSR has carried out such tests later than 3 October this year. But (?Simms), a Pentagon representative stated indignantly: We absolutely cannot understand the reasons which prompted Congress to make such a decision which does not contribute to the process of strengthening peace nor to the arms control process.

It is funny to hear the Pentagon which spends hundreds of thousands of millions of dollars suddenly starting to show concern for the pockets of Americans. The point here is that on 12 December when the Air Force launched two ASAT testing targets into space the launch cost approximately \$20 million and now the Pentagon is grieving if the Congress bans testing -- for that would mean that these \$20 million of tax payers' money was wasted. Now just take in this astounding logic: First I take your money and then I start complaining that I'm not being allowed to spend it.

Generally speaking it isn't easy dealing with Americans. They dance about intimidating themselves and intimidating us, showing their fists. But nowadays it is generally better to show intelligence though that is, of course, harder.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1231

- END -